NOTES ON BRAHMAN

by

J. GONDA

Professor of Sanskrit, Utrecht University

1950

NOTES ON BRAHMAN

by

J. GONDA

Professor of Sanskrit, Utrecht University



Price: 5 guilders

J. L. BEYERS

Utrecht

1950

I.

After Roth, who did not attach much value to the etymological explanations of the indigenous grammarians and lexicographers [1]), tried to render the meaning of the term *bráhman-* by "die als Drang und Fulle des Gemuths auftretende und den Gottern zustrebende Andacht, überhaupt jede fromme Aeusserung beim Gottesdienst" [2]), the 'original meaning' of this extremely important concept has over and over again been commented upon, without the authors having attained agreement. There is much wisdom in the verdict given by Keith [3]): the word already in the ṚV confronts us as an established term doubtless with a long history, which we are scarcely likely to determine to the general satisfaction, and the present writer has always been averse from dealing with such vexing puzzles as probably are, at least for the time being, insoluble. Yet, it seems expedient, especially when concepts of outstanding importance are concerned, to follow up the inquiry on problems which may be related to the riddle and to go on with criticizing the views of predecessors and bringing to the fore such aspects of the question as seem not to have attracted sufficient attention [4]).

The incorrectness of Roth's explanation is self-evident and has long since been recognized. It is, in general, advisable in books on Hindu subjects, to utilize Christian terms only with the utmost care, and, if possible, not to use them at all to explain Indian concepts. In their well-defined dogmatic sense they do not answer to Indian ideas and in a vague and popular meaning they are unfit for scientific definitions and explanations. To the etymology given by Roth (*bráhman-* ∾ √ *bṛh-*) we will, however, recur.

Oldenberg [5]), subscribing to the view of Griswold [6]), who pointed out that *bráhman* is very often used of the words addressed to the gods, supposed "hymn, holy word, Vedic text" to be the original meaning of the term, which then developed into "magical word or formula" ("zauberkraftiges Wort") — "*brahman* ist genauer die heilige (zauberkräftige) Formel und das sie erfullende Fluidum der Zauberkraft" [7]), — from which meaning, he argues, in course of time evolved the concept "Potenz, die den Brahmanen zum Brahmanen macht", and,

finally the idea of "Allwesen". This interpretation has, in the main, repeatedly been adopted [8]) and is to this day obviously taken for granted by various scholars: "Les Brāhmanas tenaient pour établi que la substance même du monde est la Parole rituelle, le Brahman" [9]); "Brahman, originally the power of the word, as it reveals itself to the brahmins in the sacrificial utterances and their reciters, became the designation of cosmic Power" [10]); "Das Wort *brahma* bezeichnet das heilige Veda-Wort, den Wirkungsvollen Zauberspruch, die Kraft, die sich in diesem verkorpert und damit schliesslich die übersinnliche Potenz, die dem ganzen Opferwesen zugrunde liegt und die Ursubstanz alles Seins darstellt" [11]) This interpretation seemed to tally perfectly with the etymology proposed by Osthoff [12]) and adopted by other scholars [13]). *bráhman-* ∾ Irish *bricht* "spell, incantation", O Icel *bragr* "poetic art" This etymology is, however, very far from being plausible, because the Irish and German words admit, on the one hand, of other explanations which are more probable [14]), and the term *brahman-*, of which, in spite of Oldenberg c s., an original meaning "holy word etc" has not been irrefutably demonstrated, may be connected with several other Indoeuropean roots and words. It is, moreover, an hazardous undertaking to arrange the meanings of an ancient Indian term like *brahman-* in such a manner that a definite process of evolution, an historical development may be read off from the very arrangement, even when this has been founded on the occurrence of definite 'meanings' in Vedic texts for which an established chronological order is almost traditionally adopted, because, first of all, even if this chronological order be in every respect right, it is by no means an established fact that a shade of meaning appearing or seeming to appear for the first time in the Atharvaveda or in the Brāhmanas is necessarily less 'original' than a meaning appearing 'already' in the ṚV., and because, among other reasons, we do not know for certain that the meanings we distinguish e g in the ṚV. were, in fact, different and definite 'meanings' and not, at best, aspects of one concept We must not forget that many meanings appearing in our dictionaries owe their existence only to the fact that the English language is not able to express the Indian concept by one word

The effort of Hertel [15]) to reinterpret the Vedic and ancient Iranian religion in the light of the hypothesis that brahman was originally a denomination of the cosmic fire, is ingenious but inadequately founded on the facts [16]) However prominent a concept this element was in the train of ancient Indian thought, Hertel has exaggerated its importance,

and, in spite of many useful combinations of facts and valuable remarks on details, overreached himself. His interpretations often distort the Vedic and Avestan texts, and the etymology on which he relies (*bráhman-* ∾ Gr. *φλέγμα*; Lat. *flagro*) convinces neither phonetically nor semantically.

His opponent, Charpentier, has been more successful in his destructive criticism of Hertel's theories than in building up a probable hypothesis of his own [17]. Adopting an etymology, advocated by Benfey [18]) and Haug [19]) (*bráhman-* ∾ Avestan *barəsman-* "the bundle of sacred twigs used at the religious ceremonies of the Zoroastrians", cf. also Ved. *barhís-* "sacrificial grass", i. e. "a bed or layer of kuśa (sacred grass), usually strewed over the sacrificial ground and especially over the 'altar', to serve as a sacred surface on which to present the oblation, and as a seat for the gods"), and, accordingly, an original meaning "sprout, shoot, plant" or "bundle of grass", hence "thriving, growth" [20]), the Swedish scholar followed in Hillebrandt's track, who [21]) tried to reconstruct the development of the meaning of the word in this way: the original sense being "Pflanzenbundel als Wachstums-, Fruchtbarkeitszauber, *vardhana-*", "Zauber überhaupt, als das ganze Opfer durchdringende mystische Kraft" was already a secondary meaning, which in course of time developed into "Alle einzelnen Arten des Zaubers: Spruch, Lied, Gesang" and, finally, into "Schopferische Kraft uberhaupt, die sich zum kosmogonischen Brahman entwickelt". Considering *bráhman-* and *barəsman-* phonetically and in the beginning also conceptually identical, he tried to demonstrate that a correct interpretation of the Ṛg- and Atharvan-texts in which the term occurs, supports Hillebrandt's standpoint in a somewhat modified formulation: we are to suppose that after a period in which rites with bundles of plants were performed (brahman rites), the term b. came to mean magic rite of any kind, including spells and magic songs. Charpentier has, however, not succeeded in proving that an original meaning "bundle of grass" etc. really exists in these collections of documents. So, there is a considerable element of arbitrariness in his construction, the etymology *brahman-* = *barəsman-* representing no more than a possibility, and some links in the semantic series (especially the meaning "Zauber, der mit Hülfe derartiger Bündel usw. ausgefuhrt wurde, Pflanzenzauber", which developed into "Zauber, Zauberhandlung, Zauberritus") being admittedly not demonstrable, and he seemingly failed to perceive how ill-founded the basis of his theory is. Moreover, he omitted to take into consideration that the meaning

of the word *barəsman-*, if it is really identical with *brahman-*, may have been a specialized one, that the bundle of sacrificial grass or the sacred twigs may have derived its name from its being or representing brahman, from its forming part of that which was denoted by that term or the root underlying it. It is, of course, within the range of possibility that a word which originally denoted an object of importance in the ritual should come into use to express the sense of "magical rite" or "rite in general", but such a development must, in each special case under discussion, be proved, or at least, be made plausible by a sound hypothesis In my opinion, Charpentier has, like other scholars, fallen into the error of constructing, in an evolutionist train of thought, a development of specialized meanings without laying a solid foundation, without proving beforehand that the material used admits of such a method, and without satisfactorily explaining the so-called later uses of the term *bráhman-* Moreover, his views with regard to the relations between magic and religion are rather one-sided and old-fashioned there is no reason to suppose that the 'religious activity' of the ancient Indian priest has sprung from a purely magical one

An etymology to which many authors subscribed is the equation proposed by L Meyer[22]) *brahman-* ∾ Lat *flāmen* "priest of a special deity, (member of a group of fifteen priests forming part of the collegium pontificum)". Other scholars, however, made more or less serious objections to it, which concern either its formal aspect (the *ā* in *flāmen*[23]); the Latin word can also be etymologically connected with other Indo-European words) or the meaning of the Indian and the Latin terms[24]). Against these difficulties which till now have not been removed, the occurrence of several important Indo-Italian equations bearing on social and religious concepts weighs something in the balance. In the last decades the French scholar Dumézil, having resolved to work out the comparatively short notes in which his compatriot Vendryes dealt with these etymologies[25]), and to elaborate a full-fledged theory on the prehistoric Indo-European 'mythology', mainly based upon these and other, often less convincing etymologies, repeatedly tried to show[26]) that — a rendering of those ancient concepts in a modern language or a brief explanation of the precise meaning of words conveying such ideas as "priest", "holy" in an ancient or foreign civilization being impossible — the hypothesis of the etymological identity of *brahman-* and *flāmen* can be corroborated by defining the complete range of ideas conveyed by these terms in all details, by describing the phenomena expressed by these terms in

their functions and relations to other phenomena and by determining the type to which they belong While performing this task he is always — and to my mind in an exaggerated way — intent on illuminating Roman texts, myths and institutions by Indian facts, and vice versa In this way the French scholar tries to reveal some hidden aspects of the original Indo-European philosophy of life and to form a clear conception of the prehistoric socio-religious system of this hypothetic 'primitive nation'. The original brahmán-flamen performed an important function in it as substitute for the royal victim, who had to be sacrified for reviving life in nature. As, according to Dumézil, the 'statut personnel', the peculiar taboos and functions of the flamen, his relations to other sacred persons, etc, even with regard to unessential details, almost completely tally with the taboos, functions and relations of the brahman, we may pass over such phonetical difficulties as the *ā* in *flāmen*

Dumézil, however, almost exclusively emphasizes the points of resemblance without entering into all those particulars which, in India, were different from their Roman counterparts [27]) He often fails to see the Indian taboos and institutions in their Indian relations [28]), and does not pay sufficient attention to the well-known fact that the functions and taboos of priests and sacred persons in general all over the world resemble each other. These persons are bearers of power and surrounded by taboos, because all sort of demons and perils usually threaten that power; if they violate the restrictions laid upon them their power will be dissipated. Among the special regulations observed by them the same or, at least, similar obligations and restrictions often recur (they must avoid drinking any sort of beverage which would heat them internally, submerging themselves in salt water or in water in general, eating definite sorts of food, they must abstain from sexual intercourse, etc.[29])) Dumézil omits going into the question whether we may not easily find a number of parallels between the taboos to which the sacred men of a definitely different culture are subject and the restrictions laid upon the flamen or the brahman enumerated in his books When comparing the flamen dialis to the brahmans in general, he forgets that the group of the fifteen flamines in ancient Rome had as a whole almost nothing in common with the Indian class of the brahmans as a whole He forgets, too, to point out the striking distinctions between the flamen who must marry a virgin, who may not spend a night outdoors etc. and the brahman, on whom these interdictions are not imposed [30]). It is, moreover, by no means necessary to accept

his constructions with regard to the mutual relations between the brahman and the Indian king which, for all I know, had no exact counterpart in a similar relation between the flamen dialis and the rex sacrorum Dumézil seems to be often disposed to a priori reasoning (or, rather, to be apt to yield to the a priori conviction that definite socio-religious phenomena and connections *must* be found in a civilization) and to be inclined to emphasize the importance of those facts and phenomena which he considers essential and which may be of use to his theories, keeping other data in the dark [31]) So, we are driven to the conclusion that the arguments of the French scholar, in spite of his ingenious and stimulating explanations, have failed to convince us

Although he rightly considers Charpentier's starting-point, the original meaning "sacred herb", "un peu limité" [32]), Dumézil endorses the former's views regarding the etymology of *bráhman-* [33]) As, in his opinion, the brahmán-flamen was, originally and essentially, "le Remède, l'Homme-Victime", he readily admits that all the shades of meaning of the neuter term *bráhman-*, into which he does not go, likewise expressed modifications of the idea "remède magique" or even denoted the very essence of that remedy So, "on conçoit fort bien que le même mot, tantôt en valeur animée, tantôt en valeur inanimée, ait désigné ici l'Homme-Victime, là les incantations du sacrifice, ailleurs le bouquet sacré qui donne au prêtre qualité pour sacrifier, — et généralement tous les instruments de la purification, tous les 'Remèdes' " [34]).

Now, are we to admit tacitly that the method followed by Roth, Oldenberg, Charpentier and other scholars [35]) is the only one which will lead to a good result? Must it be taken for granted that we shall be able to reconstruct, in conformity with the real historical facts, a detailed semantical evolution, a series of meanings sprung from each other in the course of time? Must we assume as a fact that the oldest meaning will be found in the ṚV., that among the Ṛgvedic meanings the most frequent or the most concrete one will represent the most original use of the word? Is it not evident that Charpentier and other scholars, in spite of the comprehensiveness of their investigations, got entangled in mere possibilities? Are we not allowed, in the circumstances, to see whether there is not another way leading to a theory by means of which our available data find a more satisfactory explanation?

As is well known, the Indians had, from the beginning, a strong inclination to reflect over the invisible and intangible reality behind

the phenomena with which they were confronted in this world They eagerly desired to know the powers or potencies in the universe, and they tried to understand the relations (cooperation, mutual influence, etc.) of these powers in order to explain the scheme of things and the phenomenal processes They tried, moreover, to avail themselves of this knowledge by various means, among which the ritual ranked first; they tried to control these potencies. Thus, one of the outstanding characteristics of Ancient Indian thought was a persistent adherence to the quest for knowledge of the mutual connection of all that has a name (whether it is, to our way of thinking, substance or attribute, spiritual or material, animate or inanimate, abstract or concrete), and is, consequently, a reality, a power, — for knowledge of the inherent causality of things And the main procedure in achieving that knowledge consisted in identifying these powers, because, in their opinion, a potency A would doubtless be known and controlled, if only its identity with a potency B, which was already known, could be established [30]).

It is, further, needless to dwell on the main characteristics of the Upanisads, the central theme of which is the search for what is true: experience can not be regarded as an inexplicable datum, the mental faculties by which we acquire it cannot be self-existent, in a word, there must be something ultimate, a self-existent reality in which all that is finite and conditioned, all our faculties and all visible and tangible phenomena rest Man is aware that he cannot derive true happiness from the finite and he tries to find out, by philosophical thinking, in what happiness consists and to gain possession of a method by which he actually obtains it He eagerly desires to be freed from evil and from death which is evil, he cries for 'eternal life'. This need for an aim or ideal to be held out to his own existence, too, leads him to the conviction of an eternal being or reality, the object of philosophical quest and the goal of religion.

At first, beside avowals of incompetence, various solutions were given of the problem of the Ekam, the One, which realizes itself in all the variety of existence. Many potencies, whether they were considered personal or impersonal, were identified with it "To what is One (*Ekam*, neuter)", the ṚV. says, "the seers give many names, they call it Agni, Yama, Mātariśvan". Ṛta, which stands for Law and Order in general and the immanence of Justice, manifesting itself in nature, cult and conduct of man, is called the father of all In turn, Viśvakarman, Bṛhaspati, Prajāpati and other 'gods' had their claims to the

supreme rank. Or the sun was regarded as the soul of all that stands and moves and, at the same time, as the ruler over it, the sun who, though being one, has many names Or the body of a primaeval giant, named Purusa ("Man") is the material out of which the world is made, "Purusa who is this all, that has been and that will be, the lord of immortality, and more than that; a fourth of him is all beings, three-fourths of him are what is immortal in heaven". But in another Ṛgvedic hymn another answer is given: "Then there was not the non-existent nor the existent; there was not the atmosphere nor the firmament which is beyond What did cover? Where? In whose protection? There breathed, windless, by its own power, that One. Other than that there was not anything beyond" "Whence are we born", the Svetāśvatara Upanisad begins, "whereby do we live? And on what are we established? At whose command do we live, in pains and pleasures, in our various conditions? Should time, or inherent nature, or necessity, or chance, or the elements, or a (female) womb, or a (male) person (*purusa-*) be considered to be the cause?" But these doubts are preceded by the words *kim kāraṇam brahma,* which perhaps mean "What is the cause? Is it brahman?", or "Is the cause brahman?" [37])

Brahman, indeed, is more and more regarded as the potency or principle from which all things are derived, as the ultimate basis of the world, as one with the true immortality and eternal reality But with regard to details individual thinkers, led by intuition rather than by logic, made various suggestions here the idea comes into the mind of the original non-existence (*asat*) wishing to be: this very wish was brahman, which by means of another highly potent entity, tapas, started creative evolution working, elsewhere, however, brahman is considered as *svayambhū-*, as "self-existing" (cf. e.g. ŚatBr. 10, 6, 5, 9), as uncreated, without a preceding *asat*; this brahman was, in the beginning, this universe, it created the gods and, having established them in the sky, the air and other parts of creation, it went up to the sphere beyond But then it considered how to descend again into these worlds. It descended again by means of name and form This grandiose vision (ŚatBr 11, 2, 3), viz the metaphysical brahman is the creating principle and at the same time that of which the worldly reality is "name-and-form" (*nāma-rūpa-*) finds acceptance and is worked out by many generations of thinkers [38]).

Although it is almost needless to dwell at length on the many texts dealing with the various efforts to identify brahman and to arrive at a more or less satisfactory definition of this concept, Ruben [39]) — not

to mention his predecessors in this field — having lately collected the Upanisadic material, it is difficult to leave the point out of our discussion According to an anonymous thinker, who wishes to speak of the rta and the true, Vāyu, the wind, is brahman, or rather, the perceptible brahman (TaittUp 1, 1), according to other authorities, however, brahman is lightning (BrhadĀrUp 5, 7), or the heart (5, 3), or the breath of life (4, 1, 3, KausUp 2, 1), speech (BṛhadĀrUp 4, 1, 2), sight (4, 1, 4), hearing (4, 1, 5), understanding (Ait 5, 3) Kumārahārita holds that "with reference to the person" the mind is brahman, "with reference to the divinities" space (ChāndUp 3, 18) 'Some' authorities, BrhadĀrUp 5, 12 says, regarded food or life as brahman, others, however, the sun (ChāndUp 3, 19, 1) or the void (4, 10, 4) And so on. How these ancient thinkers wrestled with the problem may be gathered from such passages as ChāndUp 7th prapāthaka, where, in the form of a dialogue between Sanatkumāra and his pupil Nārada, progressive worship of brahman as 'name', speech, mind, intention, thought, meditation, understanding, strength, food, water, heat, space, memory, hope, breath of life, truth, intention, faith, methodical way of life, activity, pleasure up to *bhūman-* (abundance, 'plenum'), which is the immortal, is expounded in detail Or from TaittUp 3, where a son approaches his father with the request to explain brahman to him "To him he taught that as food, as breath, as sight, as hearing, as mind, as speech Then he said to him: 'That, verily, from which beings here are born, that by which when born they live, that into which they enter at their death, that is brahman' " Then the son considers food to be brahman, but, after having performed tapas again, he discovers that food, or matter, cannot account for life-phenomena and now understands that brahman is the breath of life But, realizing that spiritual phenomena are not explicable by that principle he hits upon mind as the ultimate Then, seeing that even this will not suffice, he arrives at understanding and, finally, at bliss (*ānanda-*), this must be identical with brahman, "for, indeed, beings here are born from bliss, when born they live by bliss, they enter into bliss at their death" [40]). Although, according to another conception, the world is the emanation of an original principle called brahman (cf. BrhadĀrUp 1, 4, 10), or pervaded by the ultimate principle as by something not itself 1, 4, 7), ChāndUp 3, 14 identifies it with brahman: "Verily, this whole world is brahman" Elsewhere, brahman, the inner power and essence of things, the unity of all that is named, is identified with *rtam* (ŚatBr. 4, 1, 4, 10) and with *satyam* (Brhad-

AiUp 5, 4; cf. ŚatBr 10, 6, 3, 1)[41]), — not to mention the well-known equation brahman = ātman.

Later generations continued discussing the problem of defining the indefinable. According to an authority, who is speaking in the Mbh. 12, a 224, persons versed in the Vedas say that brahman, which is deep and impenetrable like a big ocean, which has neither beginning nor end, which is imperishable and perishable, which, though it is by nature without characteristics, enters all objects and as such is invested with characteristics, which is eternal, — is Time. Brahman in the form of Time is the refuge of all beings (Cf MaitrīUp 6, 14 s But some say that brahman is fire, some that it is Prajāpati, or the seasons, or the month, or the fortnight, or the days or moments Thus various people speak variously of it, which is one "But know that it is Time, under whose control all things are" And in the same book of the great epic, a 232, we are taught that brahman is "seed or essence, consisting of splendour" (*tejomayam śukram*), and a 233, 17 the sound of air or space is identified with the unmanifest, highest, eternal brahman [42]). Whereas, according to the epic philosophers, the souls and nature are no self-sufficient realities, but represent modi of the one ultimate brahman, the Sāṃkhya system considers brahman to be a denomination of the attributeless souls (which are unproduced and everlasting) in their entirety [43]), and, besides, makes use of the term to denote *prakṛti-*, nature, an immense complexity of elements which is always changing, one, uncaused, independent, eternal and all-pervading [44]) According to the interpretation adhered to in the Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā God (Īśvara) is above all, and then there is the unchangeable, brahman, consisting of the sum-total of the puruṣas, further the prakṛti and time (AhS. 7, 1 ss.) [45]) The first chapter of the Vedāntasūtras, dealing with brahman, discusses several descriptions of the highest principle given in the Upaniṣads, and, while criticizing the Sāṃkhya doctrine, tries to reconcile the different Vedic statements on it, but their commentaries are far from being unanimous with regard to details: Śaṅkara — to mention only this — defends the doctrine of a brahman devoid of all qualities; when the ancient texts describe it as the reality, the pure consciousness, and the infinite, they do not speak of qualities belonging to brahman, but of concepts that are identical in meaning, referring to the same undifferentiated identical principle, which is absolutely without qualities. Rāmānuja, however, whilst arguing that it is impossible to prove the existence of an unqualified reality, holds that brahman, being the supreme personality, and quali-

fied by knowledge, power and love, is the central unity when souls and nature are considered as its attributes, or the supreme reality of which the world is the body or the attribute, etc Madhva, later on, defends the standpoint that brahman, possessing every kind of perfection, is not limited by its attributes which are absolute in their character

Thus Indian thinkers recognize that the supreme source of creation and the essence of reality can never be completely defined or comprehended by the human mind Yet numberless individuals, following different lines of thought, have, from the time of the Upaniṣads onwards, tried to arrive, in various ways, at a convincing theory of the Ultimate, or to throw light upon the aspects of the Incomprehensible. To a faithful Vaiṣṇava, who is driven by his religious experience to admit the infinite as a personal being, brahman is God, is Viṣṇu, and he will try to harmonize the ideals of his religion with his theoretical views about brahman. Others who, being ready to bow, with Śaṅkara, before the great mystery, while leaving it mystery, prefer an essentially philosophical dealing with the problem, will hold to the doctrine that the self-manifested subject-objectless intelligence, which is also reality, forms the ultimate and unchangeable substance of both the mind and the world.

In a word, the suggestions of truth and the guesses at the essence of the ultimate reality are numerous. Yet, it is known to every student of Indian philosophy that the brahman concept, however important it is, however much the non-dualists focussed their thoughts on it, did not play such an essential part in the trend of thought of other people Those, e.g., that adhered to Patañjali's Yoga system which strives after the absolute independence of every individual soul, did not concern themselves about the ultimate unity of all that has a name.

Now, there is ample evidence to show that already in 'pre-upaniṣadic thought' the term *bráhman-* did not mean the same thing to all who used it, that there was much diversity of opinion among thinking people who tried to fathom its boundless content, that, according to circumstances, it was differently interpreted and identified, that it manifested itself in manifold form

According to the poets of the ṚV. brahman may be in the possession of the gods, or, at least, be connected with them (7, 33, 11) [10]) They are strengthened by it (2, 12, 14; 1, 31, 18). Priests are able to make a brahman for the gods (3, 53, 13); Indra stimulated his impetuosity by the b. of the singer (2, 17, 3). For brahman, or a brahman can also belong to ṛṣis or to an individual ṛṣi: the brahman of Viśvāmitra

protects the Bharatas (3, 53, 12), being obviously a power or influence for good "May our brahma gain the victory in the battles" (1, 152, 7) The gods are invited to come to "our brahmans" (2, 34, 6) Man desires to obtain wealth and brahman (8, 6, 9), which in its turn is requested to give property. Brahman is called rich in offspring, or giving offspring (9, 86, 41) It can be activated (7, 37, 4; 103, 8) It is possible to dispel darkness by it (5, 40, 6: Atri found the sun by the "fourth brahman"); it can sharpen weapons (6, 75, 16) Without doubt, the term very often stands for the hymns or stanzas accompanying the ritual[47]) (cf. also ŚatBr. 4, 1, 1, 20 "this yajuh-formula being b."), but it can also denote the rite itself (3, 13, 6; 9, 96, 10), which has more than once the character of a magical or magico-religious ceremony to impart strength, power, vitality etc (cf e g AitBr 7, 22, 4 *brahma vai yajñah*, ŚatBr 3, 1, 4, 15, 5, 3, 2, 4). However much it is handled or operated by singers or priests, gods are (8, 35, 16) invoked to impel or animate it It is no more than natural that in the RV the term generally applies to power or powerful objects or concepts connected with the ritual, the priests and the gods But it is also obvious that its meanings or shades of meanings represent only facets or manifestations of an idea which is more general than "sacred word, stanza, hymn, rite, ritual potency, etc", which is even more comprehensive than these objects added together, and that these objects are designated by the same name, because they all participate in or partake of that important and central concept.

Whereas the poets of the ṚV used the term to designate their sūktāni, to the authors of the AV it could mean their own compositions, and although it has, in this connection, often been translated by "charm",[48]) *brahman-* has, in that corpus, this meaning only in so far as the Atharvanic texts happen to have that character. It is, however, no arduous task to trace Ṛgvedic stanzas, in which the meaning of the word has this Atharvanic shade. But there is, to my mind, irrespective of this fact, no reason whatever to suppose that 'the meaning "charm"' and 'the meaning "prayer" etc.' belong, chronologically, to different periods, or even that one of them is a development of the other, only because the completion of these corpora in their entirety and as such was effected at different moments

Among the magicians speaking in the AV brahman can be a means to "sharpen the war-drum" (5, 20, 10), and with the brahman of Agastya the operator of a healing ceremony threatens to smash the worms (5, 23, 10); in connection with other healing rites it is likewise

an influence for good (e g. 1, 23, 4). In philosophical circles, however, brahman is a cosmogonic power, "by which the earth is created (or founded), the sky is set above and the atmosphere, the expanse, set aloft and across" (10, 2, 25; "brahman in the beginning spread the sky", 19, 23, 30), and which came into being from time, from which the waters took their origin (19, 54, 1) Elsewhere brahman is a mysterious substance or power with which the sun fills the sky and the atmosphere (13, 1, 9) Within the sphere of conceptions that put brahman in relation to the sun (cf. st 1 and 6) is also AV 11, 5, where the brahmacārin [49]) is treated as an incarnation of brahman (cf st 22); though he himself is "prior born of brahman", it is born from him (st 5, 7); yet, at the same time he is said to bear "a (or the) shining brahman, in which are woven together all the gods" (st, 24); this brahman defends all the breaths that all who are of Prajāpati bear in their persons (*ātmasu*, st 22) To the mystic who is speaking 4, 1 brahman or the brahman, which was first born of yore, was unclosed from the well-shining edge (the horizon? [50])) by Vena, and in the mind of the poet who made the difficult stanzas of 2, 1, where, however, the word does not occur, "that what is highest in secret, where everything becomes of one form, of which three quarters are deposited in secret", which was seen by Vena, may have been identified with brahman [51])

In the trend of thought of the experts to whom we owe the Brāhmaṇas and the texts connected with them brahman is sometimes identical with fire (ŚatBr 1, 3, 3, 19, 4, 2, 2 etc), with speech (2, 1, 4, 10), with the sacrifice (3, 1, 4, 15), with the Vedas (cf KausUp 1, 7); with the palāśa tree or with the leaf of that tree (1, 3, 3, 19 [52])), with the skin of the black antelope [53]) In the ŚatBr. (5, 4, 4, 9 ss) the king and the priest address each other as bráhman, and the AitĀr. (3, 2, 3) states that the brahman priest is full of it It is sometimes conceived as a potency, which neutralizes the dangerous power of the sacrifice (KausBr 6, 14; GopBr. 2, 1, 2), which enables the gods to gain the victory over their opponents (ŚatBr 1, 5, 4, 6), and which, filling them, made them immortal (11, 2, 3, 6) From terror of brahman the sun rises, the wind blows, Agni, Indra and Death (Mṛtyu) run away (TaittUp. 2, 8, 1; cf KathaUp. 6, 3), it is, indeed, a great fear, an upraised thunderbolt (KaṭhaUp 6, 2) But it is also the true, or truth (*satyam* ŚatBr. 2, 1, 4, 10) and a bridge to immortality (ŚvetUp. 6, 19; MuṇḍUp. 2, 5). In ascetic circles brahman was sometimes regarded as a being able to think and to perform tapas (ŚatBr 13, 7, 1, 1) and a

knower of dharma invokes it to purify from sin (BaudhDh. 2, 5, 10).

So, it is not to be wondered at that not only ordinary people could not keep pace with the mystics and philosophers who tried to fathom the depths of the mystery they called brahman and who in course of time set their mind on conceiving it out of space and time and free from all qualities, but that also the gods were not able to understand it when it appeared to them, and so asked themselves what supernatural or wonderful being [54]) it was (KenaUp 3, 2). That brahman was, indeed, considered as inconceivable has more than once been admitted [55]): Brahman is higher than understanding (MuṇḍUp 2, 2, 1), and the very attempt to conceive of it shows that one does not know the essential fact about it: "He by whom it is conceived of knows it not, it is not understood by those who [say they] understand it" (KenaUp 2, 3).

Is it surprising that, under the circumstances, a great Indian scholar in this branch of learning, after a short survey of the main answers proposed by modern experts to the question of how brahman came to denote the supreme reality, has written: "We need not trouble ourselves about the etymology of the word. To us, it is clear, Brahman means reality, which grows, breathes, or swells" [56])?

The plan to write the present paper, however, has been suggested by the conviction that this very idea of growing and swelling, beside other ideas often connected by Indian thinkers and authors with the word brahman, have not been duly considered by modern scholars writing on the subject.

As is well known, the idea of supranormal power assumed a central position in the discussion of religious phenomena with the introduction, by Codrington [57]), of the mana concept [58]). And when this idea or ideas similar to it were also discovered in other parts of the world, it did not fail to induce a number of scholars to search for the solution of the brahman riddle in such 'primitive' concepts as 'mana' stands for. Hubert and Mauss, "two faithful students of Durkheim, [who] made a sweeping application of the mana concept in their treatise on magic" [59]), tried to identify brahman and mana [60]). According to Söderblom [61]), the brahmán is the medicine-man, the shaman, and bráhman belongs to the "Gruppe von mana-Ausdrücken". Strauss, referring to them, expressed himself in a more cautious way: "Die Konzeption eines Zauberfluidums, das sich wie das Bráhman in Wort und Lied verkörpert, das ferner eine Potenz ist, mit der Götter und

Menschen operieren, muss in eine ganz niedrige Kulturstufe zurückreichen Diese Annahme wird bestätigt durch das Vorhandensein eines Glaubens an eine dem Bráhman ähnliche Potenz bei den Melanesiern" [62]). Oldenberg [63]) tried to reconcile this mana-theory with his view that the original meaning of the term brahman was "das heilige, zaubermächtige Vedawort und das ihm sowie seinen Inhabern innewohnende mysteriöse Fluidum". although the difference between these concepts must, of course, not be overlooked, "bleibt immerhin die Gleichartigkeit des Brahman mit Mana, Orenda und Verwandtem gross genug, um zur Charakteristik des freilich schon durch den Veda allein deutlich indizierten geschichtlichen Niveaus beizutragen, dem die Vorstellung vom Brahman in ihrer hohen Altertümlichkeit zunächst angehört" While I share the view that during the Vedic period individual thinkers have greatly contributed to deepening the understanding of the brahman concept and to enlarging its extent, I am — in contradistinction to Von Glasenapp [64]) — sceptical about the validity of the argumentum e silentio and Oldenberg's chronological explanations. Yet, I have no reason to join with Charpentier [65]) in calling in question the heuristic and illustrative value of studying such ideas as mana and orenda in primitive cultures for research-workers in the field of Indian religion. The reading of the books and papers written on these concepts cannot but corroborate the statement that they have much in common with the Vedic brahman concept

Yet, a word of warning seems necessary. Much has been written about the scope and meaning of the term *mana* [66]), which, by the way, seems to be a prevailingly Polynesian concept, that, according to Hogbin and other authors, is not found in all parts of Melanesia [67]), and while some research-works emphasized the impersonal character of mana which, according to them, is not a human being nor a ghost or spirit, but just power, magical potency, other authors tried to demonstrate that the source of that supranormal power was believed to be the activity of spiritual beings [68]). There has also been much theorizing about mana and, in course of time, the term has come to be used with various connotations [69]). So, if we make use of the term in connection with Indian religion, we run the risk of shedding Polynesian light on Indian concepts and of overlooking the distinctions between, e g., a brahmán and a Siberian shaman, or an American Indian medicine-man, or to reinterpret the Indian concepts in accordance with modern theories on the mana idea in general. In both cases, and especially if we happen to be theorists lacking profound knowledge

of the culture, the religions, and philosophy of India, we shall fail to observe the specific characteristics of the Indian idea, and to do justice to the undeniable fact that brahman is a central concept among a large number of concepts from which it cannot be detached, that it is invested with such a wealth of ideological implications and specified speculations that generalization in the light of so-called primitive standards of thinking would lead us to overlook the typical Indian superstructure. If, to evade these risks, we should prefer to use the term mana in an extremely vague sense which does not coincide with the more definite and qualified concepts the Pacific mana, the Algonquian manitu, the Iroquois orenda, the Vedic brahman etc. etc. stand for, we had better avoid the term and speak of 'power'.

II.

After a remark by Bopp, Roth was the first western scholar to connect *bráhman-* with the root *bṛh-* (2 *barh-* causative "Jmd feist machen, kräftigen, stärken")[1]. Pott, following him, expressed himself like this: *bṛh-* means "gross machen, kräftigen", "der Priestername *brahmán-* m. ist entweder eine Uebertragung des Namens einer Gottheit auf seinen Diener . . . , oder aber war das Wort hier und bei *Brahmā* als ein Grosser, als der Grosse (Gott) und als das Grosse (τὸ πᾶν) gefasst"[2]. Whereas it does not clearly appear that all later scholars, who concurred in this etymology with Roth, have completely subscribed to every detail of his reasonings, they did not enter into the merits of the etymology.

Yet Indian thinkers and authors have always argued that *bráhman-* must be etymologically connected with the root *bṛh-*, *bṛṃhati*.

After the Naighaṇṭuka already explained the term by *udakam, annam, dhanam* ("water, food, 'wealth'", see Nirukta I, 96; 211; 228 Bibl. Ind.), the commentary connects it with √*bṛh- vṛddhau* (2, 8, 15) whilst adding: *parivṛḍhaṃ bhavati sarvaprāṇibhiḥ, sarvadā bhujyamānam apy anupakṣīyamāṇatvāt, svabhāvato vā parivṛddhaṃ sarvasya jagato bharaṇāt, vardhante 'śeṣabhūtānīti 'jātāny annena vardhanti'* (TaittUp. 2, 2) *iti śruteḥ*. And 2, 11, 24 *brahma . . vardhante 'nena dhanādayaḥ, bṛṃhakaṃ vā bhogānām*. The Nirukta says, 1, 7, *brahma parivṛḍhaṃ bhavati*, i.e. "*b.* is (to be explained by, or means) the p.p.p. of *bṛh-* (*vṛh-*)" (*parivṛḍhatvāt sarvasya jagato bharaṇāt*, Maheśvara) and 1, 8 *brahmā parivṛḍhaḥ śrutataḥ, brahma*

parivṛdhaṃ sarvataḥ, and so on. How to translate?. "Der B. gestärkt durch das was überliefert ist; das B gestärkt durch das all?" Rather: "Der B mächtiger als die Überlieferung, (weil er der Träger derselben ist) und das B mächtiger als das All, weil dieses nur durch das erstere besteht" (Haug). But see Maheśvara. *brahmā parivṛdhaḥ parivṛddhaḥ śrutata iti nirvacanam. anya ṛtvije ekavidyāḥ, brahmā tu trayīvidyaḥ, ataḥ sa tebhyaḥ parivṛddhaḥ śrutataḥ brahma parivṛdham sarvata iti: śabdasārūpyaprasaktasya nirvacanam brahma hy evam ṛgyajuḥsāmalakṣaṇam aparaṃ jagataḥ kāraṇam aparam annam tat sarvam parivṛddhaṃ sarvato 'nyataḥ*

TaittBr. 3, 12, 9, 7 states: *nāvedavin manute tam bṛhantam* (*b.*: *mahāntam* Comm) "He who does not know the Veda cannot comprehend that *bṛhat* One". AtharvaśiraUp. 4 argues in this way. *atha kasmād ucyate param brahma? yasmāt param aparaṃ parāyaṇam ca bṛhad bṛhatyā bṛṃhayati, tasmād ucyate param brahma*, translated by Deussen [3]) in the following way "Aber warum heisst er das höchste B? Weil er das Höchste des Höchsten, das höchste Ziel, das Starke (*b*) ist und durch starke [Zauberkraft] erstarken macht (*b b.*), darum heisst er das h B"

The Viṣṇu Purāna (3, 3, 21) states. *bṛhattvād bṛṃhanatvāc ca tad brahmety abhidhīyate* "that is called brahma because it is *bṛhat-* and *bṛṃhaṇa-*" (to these words which are derived from √*bṛh-* we have to return); to which text the commentator annotates: *bṛhattvād aparicchinnarūpabrahmātmakatvāt bṛṃhaṇatvāc ca vedādīnām kāraṇatvād āvirbhāvakartṛtvād iti yāvat* From these words it appears that the etymologic connection with *bṛhat-* was explained by its being uninterrupted or infinite, and that with *bṛṃhaṇa-* by its being the cause by which the Vedas and all things are developed. The explanation of the Viṣṇu Pur is also found in the Vāyu Pur (4, 31 s *bṛhattvād bṛṃhaṇatvāc ca bhāvānām sākalāśrayāt / yasmād bṛṃhayate bhāvān brahmā tena nirucyate*), BrahmāṇḍaPur 1, 3, 21 s and LiṅgaPur. 1, 8, 70 In the Harivaṃśa (14949) the same etymology applies to the god Brahmā *bṛhatvād bṛṃhanatvāc ca tasmād brahmety śabditaḥ* The following quotation is taken from the SauraPurāṇa (45, 41) *bṛhattvād bṛṃhanād brahma bṛṃhate ca parasparam / tasmād bṛhati yat tasmāt param brahmeti kīrtitam*

According to Śaṅkara the word *brahman-* is derived from *bṛhati* "to exceed" (*atiśayana-*) In commenting upon the VedāntaSūtra's (1, 1, 1) he says: *brahmanityaśuddhabuddhamuktasvabhāvaṃ sarvajñaṃ sarvaśaktisamanvitam brahmaśabdasya hi vyutpādyamānasya*

nityaśuddhatvādayo 'rthāḥ pratīyante bṛhater arthor arthānugamāt "Brahman is essentially eternal, pure, intelligent, free, omniscient, omnipotent, for if we trace back the word brahman to its root, we instantly recognize that the meanings "eternity, purity, and so on" belong to it, because these meanings follow from the meaning of the root *brh*-". And elsewhere, in his commentary on TaittUp 2, 1 the same authority states that brahman derives its name from its being *bṛhat*- to the highest degree, that the highest is the unsurpassed, and that this [very unsurpassable] is brahman, is the highest: *bṛhattamatvād brahma ... param niratiśayam ... tad eva brahma param* And Rāmānuja, though objecting to Śankara's doctrine in essential points, proclaims the same root to underly the word *brahman*- (ŚrīBhāsya 1, 1, 2). *anavadhikātiśayabṛhat bṛṃhanaṃ ca bṛhater dhātos tadarthatvāt* "something which is to an unlimited degree and in a superior manner *bṛhat*- and which is a *bṛṃhana*-, because this is the meaning of the root *bṛh*-". And, to cite a third famous philosopher, Madhva shares their view: "Gott ist" — thus Von Glasenapp[4]) sums up his statements about brahman = God — "dasjenige Wesen, durch welches Schöpfung ... bewirkt wird ..., das was vollkommen ist und anderes vollkommen macht (*bṛṃhati bṛṃhayati ca*, z B S II, 3, 5), das, in welchem alle Vollkommenheiten in höchster Vollendung vorhanden sind (*bṛhanto hy asmin guṇā ity śruteḥ*, BS-Nyāyavivaraṇa 1, 1)". Other authors of the Madhva school, in defining brahman, remark that *bṛha*-, which is a constituent of the word *brahman*-, has several technical meanings, such as "class-notion" (*jāti*-), 'soul in the living being, soul in the saṃsāra' (*jīva*-), Brahmā. But its etymological meaning is "the entity in which there is a fullness of qualities", and this etymological sense, they add, can prevail. That this etymology is approved of to this day, may appear from this last quotation. "Brahma is that by which the worship of God is expanded or elaborated (from *bṛṃhita*-)"[5]).

What, now, is the exact meaning of the root *bṛh*- (*bṛhat*-, *bṛṃhati*, *bṛṃhana*- etc.), which in the above quotations has been rendered by "to be perfect (vollkommen sein)" and "to expand or elaborate", and which (i e *bṛṃhayati*) Roth translated by "feist machen[6]); kräftigen, stärken"; Pott by "gross machen, kräftigen"; Monier-Williams[7]) and others by "to be thick, grow great or strong, increase"; Renou cum suis[8]) by "augmenter, faire accroître, agrandir, fortifier" (*bṛṃhayati*) and which has been interpreted as expressing "l'idée de grandeur intensive", "un pouvoir d'expansion infinie", the ideas of "grand et

généreux", "quelque chose comme l'abondance, la puissance, la grandeur, la générosité foncières de l'être" [9])?

The present-stem *bṛṃhati* is comparatively rare: AitBr 6, 28 *ātmānam prāṇaiḥ paribṛṃhann eti* "he continues to support his body with the vital airs" (*parito vardhayan* Sāyaṇa) etc., see farther on (*pari-bṛh-*) The compound *sam-bṛh-* means "to join firmly, to combine strongly etc" (AV 9, 3, 3; ŚatBr. 1, 7, 3, 4). The part perf *babṛhāṇa-* (RV. 5, 41, 12 applies to a rock or mountain (cf *bṛhat-*) "firm, solid" Etc From Suśruta 2, 190 etc *kṛśaṃ bṛṃhayati sthūlaṃ karśayati* it appears that *bṛṃhayati* can express the meaning "to make large, big, massive, thick, solid" The ppp *bṛṃhita-* of the *-ayati* verb often applies to persons or objects which are said to be supported or strengthened in some way or other Cp e g. KālikāPur. 28, 18 Viṣṇu is *trailokyagrāsabṛṃhitaḥ*, 25, 40 the twelve Ādityas are *jagadbhogyopabṛṃhitāḥ* "invigorated, strengthened", KāmNīt 7, 56 *vājīkaraṇaṃ.* (? "aphrodisiacs") Mbh 1, 143, 16 Yudhiṣṭhira asks the chiefs of the Kauravas to pronounce blessings on the Pāṇḍavas· *prasannamanasaḥ sarve puṇyā vāco vimuñcata / āśīrbhir bṛṃhitān asmān na pāpam prasahiṣyate* " so that, being strengthened (immunized) by the blessings will we not be touched by evil", Manmatha Nath Dutt [10]) translated: "acquiring prosperity with it". Ibid 2, 79, 6 Kuntī addresses Draupadī who takes her leave: *ariṣṭam vraja panthānam madanudhyānabṛṃhitā* (explained by Nīlakaṇṭha. *strīguṇena pātivratyena yuktāpi mātṛguṇena vātsalyenāpi vardhitā*) "depart in safety, strengthened (blessed) by my sympathetic thought" The same expression is used by Bhīṣma (12, 54, 23) when declaring that he has now become able to speak, because by Kṛṣṇa's favour (*prasādāt*) he has acquired an auspicious clarity of mind, and because he has been strengthened by the sympathetic thought of the same divine hero (who, having been adored by Bhīṣma, had vouchsafed him a vision of his universal form and divine knowledge). BhāgPur. 1, 15, 29 *vāsudevāṅghryanudhyānaparibṛṃhitaraṃhasā / bhaktyā* "by bhakti, of which the impetuosity was mixed up with and upheld by the contemplation of V 's feet". Cp. also BhāgPur. 3, 1, 4 *praśnaḥ sādhuvādopabṛṃhitaḥ* "a question loaded with applause" (such ideas as "imbued, filled and heavy with . . ." arise in the mind).

We repeatedly come across the expression *bṛṃhita-* by the tejas of a powerful being, e.g Mbh 8, 34, 11: Śiva promises to kill the Dānavas *yuṣmattejo'rdhabṛṃhitaḥ,* which must mean something like "endued with only one half of your (united) energy": st. 9 Śiva makes the

proposal that the gods will kill their enemies with the half of his own energy and prowess, but he is told in answer that they are not able to bear (*bibhartum*) that; he eventually takes the half of the gods' tapas (12) and becomes more powerful than all others in strength Mbh 5, 16, 16 "O Indra, having got the foam of the water which was strengthened by (or endued with) the tejas of Visnu you have killed Vrtra " Harivam a 10437 (= 180, 3) Krsna rides the Garuda and assumes a figure like that of the moon, the sun and Indra; his figure stands forth in all beauty, endued with Hari's tejas *śuśubhe rūpam . bṛmhitam haritejasa* See also BhāgPur 6, 9, 53, and MārkPur 82, 53 *naśavanta 'smagaṇān devīśaktyupabṛmhitāh*, id. 57, 64 *sukhaleśopabṛmhitaih*

The meaning of the root can also be understood from such texts as Mbh 5, 113, 3, where it is used in connection with the noun *mantra-*. a brahman woman offers food to her guests "that has been given power (that has been consecrated) by formula's which are usual when portions of food are offered" (*balimantropabrmhitam*); as is well known, a mantra possesses power, with which we can imbue a person or an object by pronouncing it *Vacanam pituḥ satyopabrmhitam* (Rām 2, 30, 31) means "the word of my father affirmed (note the English word, < Lat *adfirmare*, from *firmus* "strong, firm", cf. also the Dutch *bevestigen* ∾ *vast*) upon oath" Kathāsarits 26, 60 *jātismaratvaṃ divvena vijñānenopabrṃhitam* An interesting text is Mbh. 12, 162, 22: the thirteen ākārās of *satya-* ("truth"), viz. self-control, forgiveness etc. *bhajante satyam eveha bṛmhayante ca* "form inherent, constituent parts of *satya-* and strengthen it (i e. are its pith and frame)"

The ppp. is often found in the BhāgPur, the redactor of which liked ancient words and archaisms 6, 4, 49 Bhagavat speaking of Svayaṃbhū says *sa vai yada mahādevo* (S) *mama vīryopabrmhitah* "endued with my vigour", or, following Burnouf [11]) " . ce grand Dieu, que soutenait mon énergie . ."; 5, 1 Prajāpati, being *viṣṇumāyopabrmhitaḥ* ("dont la Maya de Vichnu augmentait les forces" Burnouf) begets 10000 sons; 7, 10, 52 *nirjitā asurā devair yudhy anenopabṛṃhitaiḥ* "quand les Asuras eurent été vaincus dans le combat par les Dieux que soutenait Bhagavat . ." (Burnouf); 45 *ya etat puṇyam ākhyānam viṣṇor vīryopabṛmhitaṃ / kīrtayet . .* . Burnouf has correctly translated: " . cette pure histoire qui est pleine des exploits de Vichnu". it is a powerful legend, because the vigour of Visnu pervades and strengthens it See also 5, 4, 11· the story of a number of great

adorers of Bhagavat who propagated his dharma is called *bhagavanmahimopabrmhitam*. The permeating, strengthening influence can also originate in holy legends (*ākhyāna-*, 2, 10, 5). 2, 9, 26 Bhagavat is said to be in possession of a body or person, which is *nānāśaktyupabrmhita-*: I would prefer "pervaded or supported by something which is inherent ..." to "composé de tes nombreuses énergies" (Burnouf). Without dwelling on the idea of śakti [12]), it may be useful to remark that according to various purāṇic and other Vaiṣṇava texts the śakti or 'energy' of God, which can never be dissociated from Him, permeates or pervades the universe; thus 'power' of brahman is regarded as the means by which it has originated the world; or it is said to be energy that transforms itself into the world; it is considered as will and thought resulting in action. Brahmā or Śiva are, according to Vaiṣṇava views, on particular occasions endowed with certain special powers of God: the influx of these powers is called *śaktyāveśa-*. In the BhāgPur. Viṣṇu is admitted to have three distinct powers, the inner power as forming his essence, the external power as *māyā* and the power by which the individual souls are manifested [13]). The same expression is found 3, 12, 48 *brahmāvabhāti vitato nānāśaktyupabrmhitah*; it seems possible to translate it in the same way: brahman, when unfolded, is pervaded by its inherent śaktis. God's essential power (*svarūpaśakti-*) is sometimes called *yogamāyā*, which, thus, stands for the manifestation of God's spiritual power as pure consciousness; when, therefore, BhāgPur. 3, 5, 22, it reads *atha ye bhagavallīlā yogamāyopabrṃhitāḥ / viśvasthityudbhavāntārthā varnayāmy anupūrvaśah*, the sports [14]) of the Bhagavān, which have in view to create etc. the universe, are said to be supported by the inherent *yogamāyā* [15]). 2, 5, 23 the author sets forth that ahaṃkāra, which chiefly consists of the tamas-guṇa, evolves from mahat (which is regarded as a creative state of nature or prakrti), mahat itself being *rajahsattvopabrṃhita-*: as rajas and sattva are constituents of nature, *brṃhita-* presumably covers the meaning of "being constituted by pervading component parts". The same meaning seems to occur 3, 6, 6, where the golden purusa residing for a thousand years on the water is called (in the last quarter of the verse) *sarvasattvopabrṃhitah*, which has been interpreted by Burnouf as "réunissant en lui toutes les existences": as, indeed, the BhāgPur., in contradistinction to the classical Sāṃkhya admits one puruṣa as the real all-pervading soul, which is the basic universal being that underlies all objects of this universe, the unconditioned and underlying reality of all [16]), the sattvas "entities, beings

etc." may be said to be the pervading constituents of the puruṣa

This Purāṇa is highly interested in theistic Sāṃkhya doctrines and endeavours to reconcile the conflicting schools of this philosophy. So, 1, 3, 32 "the other form" of the Highest is described, viz the *jīvo yat punarbhavaḥ* "the soul or self which is forced to be born again": this form is not manifested and *avyūḍhaguṇabṛṃhitam* (there is a varia lectio in the Bombay ed and in the Nirn. S. text, *yad avyaktam apy ūḍhaguṇavyūhitam*, "parce qu'elle résulte de la réunion des qualités non encore organisées" Burnouf) (in the saṃsāra) the souls or selves, which essentially are merely God's parts, are (according to doctrines set forth in the same text) brought, by God's own inherent energy, into association with the guṇa's, which are the various manifestations of God's *māyā-power*: *this condition of being associated with the* unseparated guṇas is denoted by the ppp *bṛṃhita-* 6, 4, 29 states that it is not possible to describe the essential nature of the Highest, because all that may be expressed by words or ascertained by mind or eyes refers to the *guṇarūpabṛṃhitam*, a quality not to be attributed to God's real nature. I would translate the adjective by "founded on and pervaded by the guṇas and the physical phenomena" ("le produit des formes et des qualités" Burnouf) BhāgPur 3, 24, 14, where Brahmā addresses Kardama (one of the original progenitors), *imā duhitaraḥ* . *tava*   *sargam etam prabhāvaiḥ svair bṛṃhayiṣyanty anekadhā* the causative presumably has a kindred meaning. these daughters (who will be given in marriage to Marīci and other primaeval progenitors) are Anasūyā "the not-envious One", who was a great ascetic and obtained miraculous powers by her austere devotion, Śraddhā "Faith", reputed mother of Kāma "Love", Havirbhū "Place of Sacrifice", wife of Pulastya, the progenitor of the demons, Kriyā "Religious Ceremony", Khyāti "Fame", Śānti "Peace, Calmness of Mind, Bliss", "by whom the sacrifice is performed" (st. 24), etc ; so, I would prefer a translation like "who will, being in it, strengthen, support and add to this creation by their supranormal power" to the interpretation given by Burnouf, who obviously took *prabhāva-* for *prabhava-* ("augmenteront . par leur nombreuse postérité") 6, 4, 20 the meaning of the ppp seems to be the same Here the verb is not qualified by nouns expressing an 'agent' or a means.

Dakṣa, the primaeval progenitor, having created gods, asuras, men, and other beings, saw (6, 4, 20) that this procreation had no pith, was not strong enough to last (*tam abṛṃhitam ālokya prajāsargam*), he, therefore, performed tapas and was advised to look for a wife and to

inaugurate sexual intercourse The German expression "hatte keinen Halt" is perhaps a still nearer approach to the meaning of the word *upabṛṃhita-* ("ne prospérait pas" Burnouf) Addressing Hari, the writer of 8, 17, 9 says . / *svasthāya śaśvadupabṛṃhitapūrṇabodhavyāpāditātmatamase haraye namas te*: I am inclined to consider this ppp of the causative as a fairly exact synonym of *bṛhat-*, cf also Burnouf's translation· "de toi au sein de qui l'intelligence parfaite et toujours puissante dissipe toute obscurité".

Even in such passages, where not all the factors prompting us to assume the full meaning mentioned above, appear, it may be present in the background: 8, 19, 13 *manyur ahammānopabṛṃhitaḥ* "anger encouraged (cf. also such English expressions as *foster, entertain* and *nourish*) by pride", 8, 24, 34 "when the deluge will come you should embark, (taking along with you) all plants and seeds and *sarvasattvopabṛṃhitaḥ* "all beings having made themselves your associates" The sense "to fortify, augment by a pervading entity" may, I think, also be inferred from the use of the verb with reference to a sound which mixes with another sound and, doing so intensifies it. Mbh 3, 151, 17 Hanumat promises to add to Bhīma's shouts with his own shouts: *tadāham bṛṃhayiṣyāmi svaravena ravam tava*; the ape's shouts will be fatal to the enemies and enable Bhīma to kill them with ease Mārk. Pur. 88, 8 the goddess Ambikā 'intensified' (added to) the roars of her lion with the clanging of her bell, in addition to these sounds she filled the space between the earth and the firmament with the twanging of her bow-string *ghaṇṭāsvanena tān nādān . . . upabṛṃhayat.* Daṇḍin, Daśak II, 2 (p 84 NirnS [10]) the person speaking argues that dharma, being *tattvadarśanopabṛṃhitah*, is not checked by artha and kāma, the compound, of which the last member is explained by *vardhitaḥ* (comm. Padacandrikā), means "invigorated by the perception of truth".

An interesting text is Mānavadharmaśāstra 12, 109 *dharmeṇādhigato yais tu vedah saparibṛṃhaṇaḥ / te śiṣṭā brāhmaṇā jñeyāḥ śrutipratyakṣahetavaḥ,* to which Kullūka supplies the following explanation . *yair aṅgamīmāṃsādharmaśāstrapurāṇādyupabṛṃhito vedo 'dhigataḥ . .* Now, the word *paribṛṃhaṇam* is found, in connection with the Vedas, also in the Mbh 12, 79, 11 *yajñāṅgaṃ dakṣiṇā tāta vedānāṃ paribṛṃhaṇam,* where in a chapter dealing with the qualifications proper to a priest and the dakṣiṇā (the so-called reward) due to him, the necessity of giving dakṣiṇās is emphasized, because it is "one of the 'limbs' of the sacrifice and a "support" or "sustaining power" for the Vedas" ("(it) conduces to the nourishment of the Vedas" M. N. Dutt),

and because "a sacrifice without a dakṣiṇā can never lead to salvation". This standpoint agrees with the views of the Brāhmaṇas, which expressly state that "in performing the sacrifice they slay it (*ghnanti vā etad yajñaṃ yad enaṃ tanvate* .) . , when slain, the sacrifice was no longer strong and well (had lost its pith · *na dadakṣe*), by means of dakṣiṇās the gods again invigorated it (*taṃ devā dakṣiṇābhir adakṣayan*), hence the name *dakṣiṇā-*, because they invigorated it thereby Whatever, therefore, fails in this sacrifice when slain, that he now again invigorates by means of dakṣiṇās, then the sacrifice becomes perfect-and-successful for this reason he gives dakṣiṇās (ŚatBr 2, 2, 2, 1; 2) The dakṣiṇā, moreover, follows the sacrifice, when it goes forth towards the world of the gods, and holding on to the dakṣiṇā the sacrificer follows (id 1, 9, 3, 1), and this is why he has the sacrifice performed[16a]) The dakṣiṇā is "vigour-bestowing" (*vayodhāḥ* AV. 18, 4, 50), healing medicine (ŚatBr. 12, 7, 1, 14); glory (*yaśas*, id 14, 1, 1, 32), it wins food (see 10, 1, 1, 10) and it enables man to gain an imperishable world Hence its being called a *paribṛṃhaṇam* The translation given in the Pet Dict ("Anhang, Zusatz") is not correct

Returning now to Manu 12, 109, we see that Kullūka considers as bṛṃhaṇas of the Veda the Vedāṅga, Mīmāṃsā, Dharmaśāstras, Purāṇas etc Although for this commentator, who here certainly has in view a wider body of literature than 'Manu' himself, the word *bṛṃhita-* may have had a somewhat more extended meaning, the use of words derived from the root *bṛh-* can, perhaps, be explained by the following remarks the Veda is said to deal with dharma and the avowed aim of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā is to ascertain (Germ *feststellen*) the nature of dharma, and, thus, to advance the understanding of the Veda, the Vedāṅgas are "six branches du savoir engendrées par le souci de consolider (from Latin *consolidare* "to fasten, establish, confirm") l'intelligence ou la teneur des textes"[17])

Or, as Sāyaṇa, who quotes two stanzas of the Pāṇinīyaśikṣā (41 s.), wherein metrics are called the feet of the Veda, ritual its arms, astronomy its eyes, the etymological explanation its ears, pronunciation its nose, and grammar its mouth, has it: *atigambhīrasya vedasyārthaṃ avabodhayituṃ śikṣādīni ṣaḍaṅgāni pravṛttāni*[18]). So, the phrase *vedān aṅgopabṛṃhitān* does not mean "The Vedas and their branches" (M N Dutt, Mbh. 12, 37, 11) As to the Purāṇas etc, they are (to cite Sāyaṇa[19]) once more), like the 'limbs' proper, instrumental in acquiring the right understanding of the Veda, which, according to a

stanza quoted by the same commentator, is afraid of a man of little sacred knowledge, thinking "he will perhaps strike me (or throw me down)", for which reason one has to 'prop' or support (*samupabṛmhayet*) the Scriptures by the Itihāsas and Purānas, which are, in a sense, inseparable from and congenial to the Veda The stanza mentioned just now, being found in the Mahābhārata (1, 1, 267), is commented upon by Nīlakantha in the following way A line like ṚV. 1, 80, 7 cd "when you attacked that mysterious beast (*māyinam mṛgam*), you have killed it with supernormal power" can be 'corroborated' or 'confirmed' (cf also the Latin *astruere*) by one who knows the episode of the killing of Mārīca in the Rāmāyana, not by others, of whom the Veda is, consequently, afraid. So, the man who wishes to understand the meaning of the Veda has to study this text The Purāna which was first told by Dvaipāyana, that most eminent amongst all narratives, enriched with the essential meaning of the Vedas, is *nānāśāstropabrmhita-* (Mbh 1, 1, 19) *uddīpitām śāstrāntarāviruddhām* (Nīlakantha) The same expression occurs Rām. 6, 95, 61 Cf also *upabrmhanīyānurodhena tadupabrmhanārthavarṇanāya.. uktam* (Comm Rāmānuja GBh 3) (We may quote in passing Hariv 5905 (107,4) *vaco 'mrtam nītiśāstrārthabrmhitam*, cf e g, KālPur. 38,2 a king is *rājanītivivardhitaḥ*). The AV is, however, *krtyābhih paribrmhitam* (Mbh 12, 342, 99), "corroborated, made effective" by the *kṛtyās* "charms, magical contrivances (such as bogeys, effigies etc.) and performances made or undertaken to injure or bewitch an enemy" Without charms and practices the texts of the AV. are obviously powerless

There are other interesting passages with nouns derived from *brh-* + *pari*. BhāgPur 5, 1, 7 the god Brahmā is said to be "resolved upon" *etasya gunavisargasya paribṛmhaṇānudhyāna-* "sympathetic thought in view of the consolidation (*samrddhi-* Comm, "Wohlfahrt" Pet Wtb; "prospérité" Burnouf) of this world, which is a product of his guṇas" Durga considers the compound *paribarhaṇā* a synonym of *parivrddhi-* "growth, increase" (or of *parihimsā* "harm"; in this case he derives the word from II *vrh-*, *brh-* "to tear, pluck, root up") (cf Nirukta 6, 18, see also 7, 12) Moreover, BhāgPur. 5, 5, 27 the word is used to convey the meaning "cult, worship": *manovacodṛkkaraṇehitasya sākṣāt krtam me* (the Highest Being) *paribarhanam hi*, the 'semantic development' can easily be understood: Divine power must be renewed and consolidated in worship. "In worship ... man seeks to give form not only to individual and to

collective experience . . . , but also to the activities of Power, indeed to its very existence" [20]) It needs no comment that also in ancient India cult very often means strengthening or confirmation of power [21])

Another meaning is represented by *paribarha-* BhāgPur 4, 3, 9, where Satī expresses her desire to join her sisters and other persons invited in attending the sacrifice undertaken by her father: *aham ca tasmin bhavatābhikāmaye sahopanītam paribarham arhitum*; Burnouf's translation ("Je désire aussi y aller avec toi pour recueillir les parures qui m'y seront données") may be correct, although I ask myself, whether *p.* does not mean "marks of honour, homage". the verb *arhati* is often used in connection with words expressing that idea Manu 2, 208 (*mānam a.*), 3, 137 (*satkāram a.*), and *upanīta-* repeatedly means "offered" of the objects used at the respectful reception of guests: Rām 2, 47, 13; Hariv 9724 The same word can, indeed, denote the regalia, or insignia of royalty which doubtless owe this name to their invigorating power: we might compare such terms as *alamkāra-*, *bhūṣaṇa-* etc [22]) One might perhaps compare Kathās 29, 99 *veśam subṛṃhitam* (translated by Tawney-Penzer "splendid dress")

The meanings "attire, wealth, furniture, etc (including retinue, train and so on)", correctly given in the dictionaries ("Alles was man um sich hat, die zum Bedurfniss oder Luxus nothigen Dinge, Staat usw" Pet Wtb), may easily be explained from the same basal meaning, the more so if the context in which *paribarha-* occurs is taken into consideration: Mbh 3, 264, 7 the king of the Sindhus wishing to marry and travelling in the Kāmyaka forest, was accompanied by many princes and *mahatā paribarheṇa rājayogyena samvṛtah* "dressed in full royal state-robes". Nīlakantha, besides mentioning the usual explanation (*p.* : *paricchadena*), expressly quotes the Viśvaprakāśa: *paribarham tu rājārhavastuny api paricchade* Rām 2, 83, 26 Bharata is said to have encamped his army which was *paribarhaśobhinī*. Rāma's commentary explains *p.* by *yātropayuktapaṭaveśmādyupakaraṇasamūham*, i.e. "a collection of requisites, such as tents, suitable for an expedition". Kālidāsa, Ragh 14, 15 Rāma gives *veśmāni paribarhavanti* to his friends, i.e. according to Mallinātha, *upakaraṇavanti* "well-furnished" Daṇḍin, Daśak. II, 2 (NirnS.[10], p 79) the words *yātrotsavādiṣvādaraprasādhitāyāḥ sphītaparibarhāyāḥ prakāśanam* are said of a young courtesan, who makes her appearance "being

carefully ornamented and attended by a splendid, (abundant) *p* ", which, according to some commentaries, means "retinue".

The form *paribarhaṇa-* is explained by *śayyādibhogasāmagrī* "comfort, such as beds etc." (Nīlakantha Mbh 12, 192, 3, parivrājakas alienate themselves from attachment to the sacred fire, wealth, wife, and "robes, seats, beds, and such other objects of enjoyment" (M N Dutt) I cannot subscribe to the view that this use of the words originates in a meaning "surroundings" [23]), I am of the opinion that the significance of "furniture, (retinue) etc" must be explained from "state, ceremonial dress" which involve the idea of strengthening

Let us now discuss other instances of the compound *pari-bṛh-* ŚatBr. 2, 1, 1, 9 the gods said: "Let us steady this base (resting-place, viz the earth), and when firm and steady (. *dṛṃhāmahai, dhruvāyām aśithilāyām*) . . 10 Accordingly, as one would extend a skin by means of pegs, they fastened (*paryabṛṃhanta*) this base 11 And in like manner he (viz. the adhvaryu) now fastens (*p -b*) that base by means of pebbles " Apart from the 'concrete', 'material' sense of the verb, which is comparatively rare, this passage is interesting on account of a special use of the adj *bṛhat-* [24]) In ŚatBr 3, 6, 1, 24 and 9, 1, 18 we come across the words *viśaivaitat kṣatram paribṛṃhanti tad idam kṣatram ubhayato viśā parivṛḍham* "he thus props (supports) the nobility by the people, and therefore the n. is here supported on both sides by the p." [25]). As ṚV 1, 10, 12, with which the action meant 3, 6, 1, 24 is performed, speaks of songs that *pari bhavantu* him who delights in songs, and as the latter is identified with Indra and the songs with the people, there is a parallel between the contents of the ṚV -text and the text of the ŚatBr , Indra and the nobility being identical; now, whatever connotation was expressed by *pari-bhū-*, it must have meant more than "encompass" (Eggeling); cf e g. ṚV 2, 2, 5; AV 12, 3, 31 ŚatBr 5, 3, 5, 7 expounds that of the six oblations which are offered before the consecration, Bṛhaspati, who is brahman, is the last recipient, and of the six which are offered afterwards, Indra, who is might and vigour, is the first recipient, *etābhyām evainam etad vīryābhyām ubhayataḥ paribṛṃhati*, i.e "with these two kinds of vigour he thus supports (and impregnates?) him on both sides". Id 5, 4, 1, 12 ss below the king's foot a gold plate is thrown, as gold is immortal life, he thus takes his stand on i l ; in a similar way gold is laid upon his head, i.e. immortal life is put into him. "He thus encloses-and-strengthens (or impregnates?) (*paribṛṃhati*) him on both sides with i.l." See also 13, 6, 1, 9.

Mbh 12, 80, 18 you should trust him who would be brought to ruin by your fall . ., you should to the best of your power advance him (*paribṛṃhayet*). Mbh 5, 158, 33 Arjuna's bow is called celestial, consisting of tejas, furnished with an inexhaustible number of arrows and *divyāstraparibṛṃhitaḥ*, which may mean "to which divine missile weapons have been added, reinforced by missile weapons", or "made strong or effective by divine arrows" BhāgPur 1,5,3 the Mahābhārata is styled *sarvārthaparibṛṃhitam* "filled (pervaded and strengthened) by all useful objects"

The meanings of the ppp *parivṛdha-* (besides *paribṛḍha-* and *paribṛṃhita-*, see the commentary on Pāṇini 7, 2, 21) are of no little interest The Nirukta texts *brahma parivṛdham bhavati* en *brahmā parivṛdhaḥ śrutitaḥ* have already been mentioned [26]), Maheśvara (Nir 1, 7) explicitly explains *parivṛdhatvāt* = *sarvasya jagato bharaṇāt*, i e. *pari-bṛh-* means "bearing, maintaining the whole world" See also Sāyaṇa's commentary on RV 5, 73, 10 *brahmāṇi parivṛdhāni stotrāṇi*, etc As will be seen later on [27]), Indian commentaries repeatedly use this word to explain the signification of the term *brahman-* *Brahma parivṛdhatamam ity upāsīta*, Śaṅkara remarks (on TaittUp 3, 10, 4, Bibl. Ind, vol 6, p 134) The meaning "lord, chief, superior", mentioned by Pāṇini (7, 2, 21 *prabhau parivṛḍhaḥ*) and repeatedly found in texts and indigenous dictionaries, has incorrectly been derived from "der Umringte" [28]) Like other words expressing the same idea (cf *prabhu-* "lord" ∾ *prabhavati* "to be powerful, prevail etc"; *īśa-* "lord, ruler, master" ∾ *īṣṭe* "be valid, powerful, to dispose of") it etymologically means "the powerful". Compare e g Mallinātha's remark on Māgha, Śiśup 5, 41 *parivṛṃhate prabhavatīti parivṛdhaḥ prabhuḥ*. See BhāgPur 5, 1, 8 *amaraparivṛdhair abhipūjyamānaḥ*; 16, 16, 6, 16, 25 *sakalasātvataparivṛdhanikara-*, Rājat 3, 278 *jagatp* "lord of the world", 5, 3 *āsatāṃ kalipariṇatyau* . [illegible] *ājñādāne parivṛḍhau bhṛtyāv ājñāparigrahe* "masters of liberality". In these cases, one might compare our word *potentate* The subst. *parivṛḍhiman-* (gana *dṛḍhādi* to Pāṇ. 5, 1, 123) means "ability, capability" (*sāmarthya-* Mallinātha): Śiśup 5, 41.

The compound *saṃ-bṛh-* is AV. 9, 3, 3 used to denote something like "to make strong by combining": . . *saṃ babarha granthīṃś cakāra te dṛḍhān* "he combined, he made your knots firm" (your: of the house) [29]) RV. 7, 31, 12 the meaning of the preposition prevails over that of the verb: *haryaśvāya barhayā sam āpīn* "unite the friends with the possessor of bay horses". Mbh 7, 4, 16 Karna, rejoining the Kaurava army and seeing the extensive encampment, "put heart

into the soldiers, heartened, encouraged them" (*samabṛṃhayat*): they now were greatly delighted (st 17), for they had been anxious to see him

III

Let us now consider the meaning of the adjective *bṛhat-*, which has been given by Boehtlingk and Roth as. a/ "dick, dicht; breit, massenhaft; b/ gross, eigentlich und uneigentlich in den verschiedenen Bedeutungen des Wortes, weit, ausgebreitet; reichlich, gewaltig, c/ hoch; d/ (von Tonen) hoch, hell, laut; etc" and as "lofty, high, tall, great, large, wide, vast, abundant, compact, solid, massy, strong, mightly . . . extended etc" by Monier-Williams; as "high, tall, great, much, abundant, important, mighty, grown-up, old, clear, loud" by Cappeller [1]); as "grand, vaste, abondant, puissant" by Stchoupak, Nitti et Renou Monier-Williams and Cappeller are not alone in the opinion that "lofty, high" must been given in the first place Macdonell [2]), Geldner [3]), and other scholars agree with them Yet, this view is, in my opinion, erroneous.

In this connection it is noteworthy that Sāyana in commenting upon the Ṛgveda, in which the adjective occurs some 285 times, never resorts to such words as *unnata-, ucchrita-, tuṅga-, ūrdhva-, ucca-* etc "high" to paraphrase *bṛhat-*. The words he uses to explain the adjective are first and foremost *mahat-* (over 180 times) "big, great, large, extensive, ample, considerable etc", then also *prabhūta-* (over 30 times) "abundant, considerable, great, numerous, much", *parivṛdha-* (11 times) "firm, solid, strong etc" (see further on), *prauḍha-* (10 times) "large, grown up, strong, mighty, dense"

Without agreeing with this commentator in every particular case we must admit that these synonyms fairly harmonize with the meanings expressed by the root *bṛh-* (*bṛṃhayati* etc) However difficult a problem it is to ascertain how far native commentators are reliable, it is clear that they did not fall into a category of errors which have often clung to the researches of Western writers, viz the proneness to rely upon 'outside information' such as etymological combinations of Indoeuropean linguistics. The other words and phrases used by Sāyana to explain *bṛhat-* are: *atimahat-, atiprauḍha-, atiprabhūta-*; *atyanta-* (5 times) "beyond the proper limit, very great, excessive, very strong"; *atyadhika-* "excessively abundant"; *pravṛddha-* "fully developed, intense, great, strong"; *atipravṛddha-*; *balavat-* „strong,

powerful, intense"; *parimāṇarahita-* "immense", *aparimita-* "unlimited"; *sarvagata-* "omnipresent, allpervading"; such phrases as *guṇair adhika-*, *guṇair mahat-*, *guṇaiḥ parivṛddha-*, and some derivatives of *bṛh-*, viz *bṛṃhaṇa-* (explained by *vardhaka-*) "making big, strengthening", *bṛṃhita-* "strengthened etc", *bṛṃhaṇaśīla-*, finally he resorts to a small number of other paraphrases, part of which will be mentioned in the following pages. The most obvious conclusion is that Monier-Williams etc, in considering "high" the first meaning of *bṛhat-*, were guided by the meaning of the IE word-family with which etymologists are accustomed to connect the Indian adjective Arm *barjr* "high", *berj* "height". MIr. *brī* "mountain", Cymr. etc *bre* "mountain, hill", *bry* "high", OHG etc *berg, berg* "mountain", Hitt *parkus* "high" etc. [4]. This etymology, to which we shall have to return later on, shows however once more that etymologists often despatch semantic matters rather lightly [5]. It would, indeed, appear to me that after a close investigation of the oldest texts, there will be hardly any reason to consider "high" the 'first' meaning of *bṛhat-*

Let us first study the meaning of *bṛhat-* in the ṚV. and start the discussion with those texts in which it appears as an adjective qualifying nouns that denote objects which are or can be, in a literal sense, "high". The chariots of the Sun, Dawn, and other gods, are frequently said to be *bṛhat-* (RV 1, 35, 4; 48, 10; 3, 53, 5; 6 etc.). Most adjectives used in connection with the word *ratha-*, denote such ideas as "fast, swift" (*āśu-*), "brilliant, splendid" (*citra-*) etc; apart from *bṛhat-* words interpreted as "high" are missing. Of course, "hoch" (Geldner [6])) is, in itself, an adjective to be attributed to "chariot", but if it means "situated at a great distance above the surface of the earth", it does not tally with the general meaning of the word; if, however, it means "having great altitude", why not "big, immense, strong" (cf Sāyana: *mahat-, prauḍha-*)? I would resort to the translation given in Grassmann's Wtb "gross, weit ausgebreitet, umfangreich", if "solid (firmly, strongly built, able to support weight, stable etc.), strong" were not preferable Cf 6, 24, 3 *akṣo na cakryoḥ śūra bṛhan pra te mahnā ririce rodasyoḥ*, which doubtless means: "Just as the axle surpasses the wheels in strength (solidity etc)", not in height! A similar remark may be ventured in connection with "a *bṛhat-* dwelling": the houses of the gods are spacious (7, 88, 5 thousand-gated); *kṣaya-* is qualified by *mah-*, *pṛthu-* etc, not by words unequivocally meaning "high". 3, 3, 2 Agni's *kṣaya-* "dwelling" (i.e. the fire-place) is called *b*: as there is no reason to suppose the piling of the fire altar to be

meant, the adj. does not necessarily express the idea of height "Heaven and earth" (*rodasī, dyāvapṛthivī*) are styled *bṛhatī* ("hoch" Geldner 1, 72, 4, 4, 56, 1), but also *mahī* "extended, great, big"; if, really, *b* means "high", the phrase represents a zeugma: when applied to "earth" and sky "high" connotes different ideas To my mind, *b* here means "firm, solid" (see above) and, at the same time, "extensive (cf. the context 1, 72, 4) and powerful" 10, 74, 4 the earth is *b*, has many children and a thousand streams [7]) 4, 1, 17 *ā sūryo bṛhatas tisthad ajrān* (*mahatah* S, "die Sonne beschritt die hohen Gefilde" Ge) "die weiten Fluren des Himmels" [8]) are meant spacious and firm, able to support the weight of the sun and to allow it to cover an enormous distance. 1, 185, 6 earth and heaven are called *urvī sadmanī bṛhatī*: I cannot subscribe to the opinion of Geldner, who translates: "Die beiden breiten, hohen Wohnstätten" and remarks "'Breit' passt mehr auf die Erde, 'hoch' auf den Himmel". In contradistinction to his translation of *bṛhatī* when it expresses a quality of *rodasī*, Grassmann (Wtb) agrees with other authors in supposing it to mean "high", when it is an attribute of *dyaus* and other words denoting the sky or the celestial light Sometimes the meaning "high" is, of course, almost self-evident 10, 28, 6 *divaś cin me bṛhata uttarā dhuḥ* "my (car-)pole is higher than "; 5, 87, 3; 8, 25, 7, but even here I do not feel constrained to consider it the only possibility; perhaps the old meaning, while being still perceptible, has been reinterpreted. (8, 25, 7 Sāyaṇa does not explain the adjective; 7, 87, 2 he has *parivṛdhe*) Elsewhere the context, explained in the same way, would point to "great": 1, 59, 5 *divaś cit te bṛhatah . pra ririce mahitvam* (*mahataḥ* S.) To my mind, the meaning of the phrase is. "the firm, fast, solid, fixed and at the same time extensive sky", cf. 1, 54, 4 Indra was able to shake the summit of the *b.* sky; 151, 4 *divo b. dakṣam ābhuvam*; 5, 47, 7 " may we acquire a support (standing-place). homage to the *b.* sky"; the sky, indeed, must have a miraculous inherent strength and solidity, because it does not tumble down, cf 2, 15, 2, see also 7, 86, 1ab Similar remarks may be made with respect to *sānu* "summit, surface (of the sky)"; cf. 4, 27, 4 contra 4, 28, 2 (*mahat-* S) As to *nāka-* "firmament": 7, 86, 1 *pra nākam ṛṣvam* ("high") *nunude bṛhantam* (etc., cf. 7, 61, 3); the same two adjectives, which are, doubtless, not completely synonymous, 7, 99, 2 (*nāka-*); 61, 3 (*dyaus*); 1, 25, 9 (*vāta-*), and in other cases [9]); elsewhere, but not frequently: *ṛ* with *vṛddha-* and *mahat-*. The latter is a common synonym· cf AitĀr. 1, 2, 1 *yad vai bṛhat tan mahat* The *svar* "(the bright space of) the sky" is likewise

regarded as *b.* 4, 3, 8, 10, 65, 1; 66, 4. "Den hohen Aufstieg (*rohaṇam*) zum Himmel" (Geldner 1, 52, 9) is also called *amavat* ("strong", "gewaltig") The word *rocana-* "the bright sky or luminous sphere", however, is not only attended by *b*, which I consider to mean "firm, great" (6, 1, 7), but also by *uttama-* (3, 56, 8), 6, 1, 7 Sāyana explains by *mahat* It is interesting to notice here that *adribarhas-* "fast as a rock" (RV 10, 63, 3) qualifies the subst *dyauḥ* (*meghaiḥ parivṛḍhā pravṛddhā parivṛddhameghā vā* S).

The rather frequent use of *b.* in connection with the noun *parvata-* "mountain" is, of course, interesting on account of the etymology mentioned above (*bṛhat-* ∾ Germ *berg* etc) One may, indeed, easily be tempted to translate 4, 30, 14 *uta dāsam* . *b parvatād adhi avāhann indra* as Geldner did: "Auch den Dāsa hiebst du, I, vom hohen Berge herab". Mountains are, however, *dhruva-* "firm, immovable, constant, lasting, unchangeable" (a word also applied to *pṛthivī* "earth"; cf also 6, 30, 5 *dṛḍham* *parvatasya*); *uru-* "broad, spacious, large, great"; *mahat-* "great"; *vṛddha-* "large"; *dādṛhāna-* "holding, firm" ("fest" Geldner); *subhū-* "strong, enormous" Sāyaṇa paraphrases *b* by *mahat-* Compare also such similes as *sthāṇur ivācalaḥ* "firm, motionless like a m ’ (BhāgPur 1, 13, 53). To the remark that the very fact that there is no other adjective meaning "high" to qualify the word *parvata-* in the RV is an argument in favour of the current opinion, because it is only too natural that a mountain should be called "high", I object in anticipation, because the Indians, while liking to denote this idea by such words as *mahīdhra-*, *mahīdhara-* etc "bearing or supporting the earth", *kṣmābhṛt-* etc "bearer or upholder of the earth", *dhara-* "bearing, sustaining etc.", by *acala-* "not moving, immovable", *naga-* "not going, not moving", *ahārya-* "not to be removed" etc, which all point to the conception that a mountain is first and foremost characterized by firmness, solidity, immobility, clearly showed little inclination to emphasize its being high Further, the ṚV, when invoking the mountains as divine powers, expressly emphasizes their being *dhruval senāsaḥ* "firmly fixed", "feststehend" (Geldner), and alludes to the well-known exploit of Indra who set at rest the moving and agitated mountains by cutting off their wings, and, by that, made firm the quaking earth (cf. ṚV. 2, 12, 2), an exploit to which the epic "wingless mountains"[10]) also refers ṚV. 4, 54, 5 Savitṛ is said to have granted to the gods the *b* mountains, which stood still at his command. To the ancient Indians, I think, mountains were impressive by a complex of properties, such as vastness, immobility, solidity, — height

being only one of them —, which they had in mind when they used the term *bṛhat-* Grassmann (Wtb), who interprets a *b* *parvata* as "a high m ", translated *bṛhanto adrayaḥ* (8, 77, 3) by "feste, starke Felsen", to which I subscribe, 8, 77, 3 Sāyana explains *bṛhataḥ* by *balena mahāntaḥ ata eva vīlavaḥ sarvato dṛḍhāḥ*, i.e "strong, firm and massive". We may, moreover, also compare such texts as RV 1, 64, 3 *parvatā iva* · *dṛḍhāngāḥ* Sāyaṇa ,7 *girayo na svatavaso* (*svakīyena balena yuktāḥ* S); 4, 20, 6 It may be remembered that the Bible also makes mention of the firmness and immovability of mountains Psalm 65, 6 "Who in his strength setteth fast the mountains"; 95, 4 "The strength of the hills is his also", 1 Cor 13, 2 ". . so that I could remove mountains" In the Chinese Yi king mountains are symbolical of resolution [11]). Compare, further, Shakespeare, K Henry IV, 1, 2, 4, 253 "gross as a mountain" [12]) In English and other languages phrases like "as firm as a rock" [13]) are quite common, and "mountain" is used in similes not only to express the idea of height, but also that of a large amount or quantity [14])

As ancient India did not draw a hard and fast line between concreta, e g a mountain, and abstracta, e g force, it is not to be wondered at that *bṛhat-* also applies to such concepts as *vayas-* "vigour, strength" [15]) (e g. 1, 125, 2; 136, 2 *prabhūtam* Sāyana): "firm, tough, stout" ("hohe Kraft" Geldner) The idea of *vayas* which is sometimes said to be in possession of the Maruts or other gods, or asked for from them on behalf of the sacrificer, can also be qualified by *uttama-*, *revat-* "abundant, brilliant", and *citra-*

An important text is 8, 15, 2 Indra's *b* *saho dādhāra rodasī* "b strength bears (holds, keeps, preserves) heaven and earth" In a similar way Indra's kratu ("power of mind"), is *b* (3, 52, 4, *mahat-* S), like that of the gods in general (1, 2, 8 *atipraudha-* S) Such concepts as *śravas*, *yaśas*, *vacas* are similarly *b* The concept *namas* "homage, veneration" is repeatedly qualified as *bṛhat-* (*mahad atipravṛddham* S 1, 136, 1, *prabhūtaṃ prabhūtaphalapradam* 5, 73, 10, *bṛṃhaṇaṃ vardhakam* 7, 94, 4) · I do not object to "intrinsically powerful" and the shades of meaning expressed by Sāyana's synonyms

It needs no comment that to such entities ("Daseinsmächte" [16])) and especially to those concepts which are usually called 'gods', a more or less clear idea of an energetic, but mysterious power is inherent We may presumably account for the very frequent use of *b* in connection with gods etc by assuming that the adjective *b* could also express such ideas of intrinsic and coextensive, potent and incomprehensible

'firmness', 'solidity' and 'reliability' as may be considered a more definite description of the nature and limits of that particular power. Thus, Indra is *b.* (3, 32, 7 *vṛddham indram bṛhantam ṛṣvam ajaram*; 6, 19, 2 etc.), and to such a god Indra such a poem is recited (1, 9, 10; *praudha* S.), and, in a similar way, Agni (2, 10, 4 he is *vayasā b.* which obviously cannot mean "high —"; 2, 1, 12 he is addressed as *vājaḥ pratarano bṛhan* "the promoting, firm (powerful) vigour (energy)"), Soma, Rudra, Viṣṇu, Sūrya and other gods are called *b.*; Sarasvatī 6, 61, 13: *parivṛdhā gunair adhikā* S., Uṣas is (1, 123, 2) *b.*, *jayantī* and *ucca* "powerful (her 'power' being of the above description), triumphant and high", this interpretation of *b.* is favoured by 5, 80, 1 *bṛhatīm ṛtena ... uṣasam* "U. *b.* by (on account of) ṛta"

In this connection the fact that *b.* is a standing epithet of ṛta "the fixed or settled physical, ritual, and moral order" deserves special mention. The term *ṛta-* is a reflex of the ancient Indian belief in an immanent cosmic order manifesting itself, independent of human control, in autonomous cosmic, physical and other phenomena, in events and phenomena which by their regularity, immutability, reliability suggest the existence of eternal and universal rules and laws. This ṛta is *bṛhat-* (*praudham, pravṛddham, prabhūtam, mahat, atyantam, sarvadeśesu vyāpakam* Sāyana). I cannot agree with Geldner's translation (1, 75, 5 etc.) "hohes Gesetz", and would consider the adjective as expressing the holding, everlasting, universal, firm, settled character of ṛta, which makes its existence and influence felt always and everywhere, which is the constant and solid principle of everything that is ordered in the universe, the firm ground which remains unchanged in all the unrest of mutation; not only the dawn and the sun, the alternations of the seasons and the streaming rivers follow the path of ṛta, but the whole universe is founded on it and moves in it [17])

In a similar way, Sāyana's comment on 6, 65, 2, where the sacrifice (*yajña*) is called *b.* (cf. AV. 6, 122, 4), is, to my mind, quite to the point: *bṛṃhaṇasvabhāva-* "of a character so as to support or to make strong". The sacrifice, indeed, plays, as has been remarked by Oldenberg [18]), to a considerable extent the same rôle as the ancient ṛta-concept, in that it dictates laws and rules to all happening in the universe; "it is the ātman of all beings, of the gods" (ŚatBr. 14, 3, 2, 1), the universal principle of life which sustains all things (cf. also 3, 6, 3, 1); together with truth, brahman etc. it sustains the earth, AV. 12, 1, 1 says.

I greatly doubt that *bṛhad devāso amṛtatvam ānaśuḥ* (RV. 10, 63, 4) should be translated, as is done by Grassmann [19]), by "die Götter sind

zu hohem ew'gen Dasein . . gelangt"; Sāyana explains by *bṛṃhitam,* I would suggest such ideas as "strong, vigorous, reliable" The author of 5, 85 speaks of a *bṛhad brahma* (st. 1) he wishes to recite in honour of Varuna (*prabhūtam* S.) the hymn, which is called a brahman because it is considered a manifestation of that general concept, is *b.*, i e. "conveying power, potent" and no wonder, for it takes part in the power of Varuṇa's deeds which it describes: Varuṇa, the great god, is mainly praised as upholder of physical and moral order; he is *dhṛtavrata-* "(the god) whose laws or order are fixed, who maintains regular, sacred rules and customs etc."

The mention of Indra's *bṛhad asuryam* ("divine nature") coincides with the statement that nobody is able to destroy what Indra preserves and maintains (6, 30, 2) 8, 15, 7 Indra's *indriyam bṛhat* is mentioned together with his vehement force (*śuṣma-*) and his power of mind (*kratu-*) The adjective repeatedly qualifies a word meaning "shelter, protection, defence" · 2, 27, 7 *bṛhan mitrasya varuṇasya śarmopa syāma* "Unter dem grossen Schirm des M und V möchten wir stehen" (Geldner; *parivṛdham* S) "firm, great, powerful"; 4, 56, 4 etc. *Bṛhat-* often occurs in connection with *rayi-* "wealth, possession(s) etc". *prauḍha-, mahat-, pravṛddha-* S , "gross, reichlich, weit verbreitet" (Grassmann Wtb.), cf. also the compound *bṛhadrayi-* "with abundant possessions" Among the other epithets of *rayi-* are *dhruva-* "lasting, etc.", *bahula-* "abundant, much", *sthira-* "(fixed,) lasting", *sthūra-* "big, solid, bulky" · 6, 19, 10 *dhā ratnam mahi sthūram bṛhantam*; 4, 21, 4 Geldner translates *sthūrasya rāyo bṛhato ya īśe* by "Der über gediegenen grossen Reichtum gebeut", here, too, *b.* has such connotations as are discussed thus far Qualifying such ideas as *raṇa-* "delight, joy" we might resort to an adjective like "intense" (3, 34, 4 *mahat* S).

In connection with "fuel" (*idhma-*, 8, 45, 2) *bṛhat* perhaps means "great, intrinsically powerful", in connection with "wind" (1, 25, 9) "intrinsically powerful" (*guṇair adhika-* S.), cf. also "the *b* night and dawn" (9, 5, 6; 10, 36, 1; 110, 6 "erhaben, hehr" Grassmann, *parivṛdhe guṇair mahatyau* S); *b* waters (10, 121, 7; 9 *mahat-* S.) When qualifying *iṣas* "refreshing draught" 9, 97, 25 *b* is explained by S. as *bṛṃhitāni pravṛddhāni,* elsewhere as *prabhūta-* or *mahat-*.

It would serve no useful purpose to go over all the passages in the other Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas, in which the adjective occurs. Let it suffice to observe that among other beings and objects the sky and the atmosphere (AV. 4, 16, 3; 6, 124, 1), gods (AV. 7, 7, 1; 10, 7, 25),

the heavenly eagle (AV. 7, 39, 1), Indra's arms (AV. 19, 15, 4 "may we dwell under the formidable (*ugra-*) arms of thee the stout one, O Indra, those two great refuges" Whitney-Lanman, rather "firm, strong"), the region (ŚatBr 8, 6, 1, 9), the light (*jyotiḥ*, ŚatBr 6, 3, 1, 15), "energy" (*indriyam* ŚatBr 14, 3, 1, 31), Indra and Agni's *bāhubhyām* and *ugram varma* "defence" (AV 8, 5, 19) are regarded as *bṛhat* So is the ordinance (*dhāma*) of Mitra and Varuna (AV 18, 1, 7), the bearing earth (AV 9, 2, 15 "firm")

The fire-pan is addressed (ŚatBr. 6, 5, 4, 13) "Having risen do thou become *b* and stand up steadfast . ., for these worlds having risen, are *b*" An interesting text is AV 8, 9, 3. "What three *b* ones there are, the fourth of which *viyunakti vācam*", here the *trīṇi bṛhanti* are, to all appearances, identical with the three parts of brahman mentioned ChUp 4, 5, 3[20]); the text adds that the brahmán may know it by tapas

For obvious reasons I refrain from going into the name of the well-known metre *bṛhatī* etc, which like other similar names is often exposed to various identifications I only observe that this metre is frequently called a foundation. ŚatBr 13, 5, 4, 28 the heavenly world is established upon it, 12, 8, 3, 24 the sun etc, 10, 3, 2, 3 this metre and Bṛhaspati belong together (cf AitBr 8, 6)

There are numerous passages in which the adjective *bṛhat-*, to which we may, on the strength of the texts discussed, ascribe such meanings as "firm great, powerful, extensive" (and often being firm etc enough to be able to stand firm or to support, and sometimes also: being so in a somewhat unusual, amazing or supernormal way) is associated in some way or other with the term *bráhman-* RV 5, 85, 1 *bṛhat* . . *brahma* the adj denotes the same idea as the noun. RV 9, 71, 1 Sāyana explains *brahma* by *bṛhat* The TaittBr 3, 12, 9, 7, states *nāvedavin manute taṃ bṛhantam* "He who does not know the Veda cannot comprehend brahman" Mbh 12, 336, 2 *bṛhad brahma mahac ceti śabdāḥ paryāyavācakāḥ ebhiḥ samanvito rājan guṇair vidvān bṛhaspatiḥ* "The words *bṛhat-*, *brahman-* and *mahat-* express the same idea; the wise Bṛhaspati was gifted with all these attributes" Also Nīlakantha, commenting on Mbh 1, 63, 100 explains *brahma* by *bṛhat*. According to Rāmānuja brahman, in a less limited sense, or in general, stands for all that has *bṛhattvam* (cf Siddhânta § 7 Lac *sarvatra bṛhattvaguṇayogena hi brahmaśabdaḥ*) Compare also such texts as Īśvarag 10, 14, and passages describing the God of gods as *bṛhat-* Mbh 12, 340, 57 *ādityavarṇaṃ taṃ puruṣaṃ tamasaḥ param / bṛhantaṃ sarvagaṃ devam īśānam*

As to the meaning of *bṛhat-* in later texts, it may be noted that it is not only the opposite of *sūkṣma-* "fine, small, feeble" (e g Mbh 3, 157, 64; Kathās 98, 53); it also qualifies the rope of Manu's ship (Kālikā-Pur. 34, 48) "strong, solid", and the ark itself (BhāgPur 8, 24, 35. 33 *viśālā* "spacious, broad, extensive") In medical texts *bṛhat-* means "vital place" [21]), and *bṛṃhana-* "making strong, — fat, nourishing"

It is important to remember that the adjective *dvibárhas-*, to be found in the ṚV., applies to Agni, Indra, Rudra, Soma, Uṣah, *rayi-*: "doubly firm, — strong etc." and, therefore, perfectly tallies with its etymological cognate *bṛhat-*, see especially ṚV 8, 15, 2 *yasya* (viz *Indrasya*) *dvibarhaso bṛhat saho dādhāra rodasī* (*dvayoḥ sthānayoḥ parivṛdhasya* S) The adj *barhiṣṭha-* is the superlative of *bṛhat-*· ṚV. 3, 13, 1.

The question whether the Vedic *barhánā* is etymologically related is one of some difficulty Sāyana's commentary on the ṚV evidently adopts two main significations a/ *mahatvam, māhātmyam* etc, and b/ *śatrūnām hiṃsā, hati-, vadharūpā kriyā, pāpānām udyamanakārin-*, etc We are under the impression that Sāyaṇa's explanation of 6, 44, 6 *ukthásya barhánā* (*b. bṛhatvam, māhātmyam*) may be right, if so, this *barhanā* expresses the strengthening power of the verses and reminds us strongly of *bṛhat-* and *brahman-*. See also 1, 52, 11 Indra's famous power (*sahas-*) was *dyām anu śavasā barhaṇā* "equalled the sky in superiority and firmness" (see under *bṛhat-*), 56, 5, 10, 77, 3 ṚV 1, 54, 5 *manasā barhaṇāvatā* may mean "mit zuversichtlichem Sinn" (Geldner)· *b* seems to bear upon "strength of character, firmness", Sāyaṇa, however, explains the word by remarking *nibarhayatīti vadhakarmasu pāṭhāt barhaṇā śatrūṇāṃ hiṃsā*. This explanation involves derivation from *bṛh-* "to tear, root up", cf *nibṛhati* "he overthrows, crushes, destroys" Cf also 1, 54, 3, 5, 71, 1; 6, 26, 5 There seems no reason to shrink from supposing that in *barhánā* two words, both admitting an approximate translation "strength, power" are blended. See, e.g., 10, 22, 9

IV.

Let us now return to the term *bráhman-* As it would serve no useful purpose to go over all the passages adduced by other authors in order to criticize their views, we will confine our remarks to the following, premising the impossibility of 'reconstructing' a process of semantical development: all that is connected with such power-concepts or represents them can, in principle, bear the same name [1])

It must first and foremost be remembered that in the ṚV *bráhman-* repeatedly appears as a vardhanam [2]), i e as something that causes to increase, that grants prosperity, that strengthens, animates. 2, 12, 14 *yasya (sc indrasya) brahma vardhanam, yasya somo yasyedam rādhaḥ* "whom the brahman (i e, sacred word), whom soma, whom this gift strengthens" (*b. parivṛdham stotram* S., cf S on 10, 49, 1 *parivṛdham karma stutilakṣaṇam*, on 4, 4, 6; 7, 29, 2; 10, 50, 4 etc.; 1, 129, 4 *b.*. *parivṛdham karma* S ; 1, 165, 2, 14 etc, so Sāyana repeatedly uses *parivṛdha-* to explain *bráhman-*); 2, 39, 8 *vardhanāni brahma stomam* (*mantrān* S) and elsewhere it is not possible exactly to render the sense of the original in an English translation [3]); 8, 1, 3 *asmākam brahmedam indra bhūtu te hā viśvā ca vardhanam (stotram* S.). "das Wort kann hier nichts als 'Zauber(ritus)' bedeuten" (Charpentier [4])): why?, cf st 1 This strengthening *b* 'fills' a god 1, 52, 7 *hradaṃ na hi tvā nyṛṣanty ūrmayo brahmāṇīndra tava yāni vardhanā* "For as the waves fill a piece of water, so the b, which cause you to increase, fill you, O Indra"; cf also 8, 98 (87), 8 *vār na tvā yavyābhir vardhanti śūra brahmāṇi*, which apparently [5]) expresses the idea that the god increases by the b. in the same manner as a piece of water by the streams Cf also 6, 23, 5 (*b : havirlakṣaṇam annam* S.). It is interesting to see that 1, 93, 6 Agni and Soma are 'augmented, increased, strengthened' by *b* (*agnīsomā brahmaṇā vāvṛdhānorum yajñāya cakrathur u lokam*), which apparently stands for "vital force" or "something in which a power that causes to swell, to increase etc inheres" (Sāyana paraphrases by *stastrā mantrarūpeṇa stotreṇa havirlakṣaṇenānnena vā*) See also 6, 38, 4 *vardhād yam yajña uta soma indraṃ vardhād brahma gira ukthā ca manma*, as the words of praise and the recitations are explicitly mentioned, *b* may express another or a more general meaning 1, 31, 18 and 5, 73, 10 however, the sūkta itself seems to be meant

The gods are, however, not the only beings which benefit by the augmenting potency represented by bráhman: in the important and difficult 'hymn to the Earth', AV 12, 1 the earth is addressed in the following way: *pṛthivīm ā vadāmi kṣamām bhūmim brahmaṇā vāvṛdhānām* "I address the patient earth, which increases (grows, becomes strong) by b.". The reason why this is wished for, appears from the second half of the stanza (which is quoted in the Kauśika Sūtra to accompany a sitting down in different ceremonies): "may we sit down, O earth, upon thee, that bearest refreshment, prosperity, a portion of food, ghee". Beckh [6]) rightly refers to the first stanza of

the same hymn, where brahman occurs among the powers which sustain the earth: *satyaṃ bṛhad ṛtam ugraṃ dīkṣā tapo brahma yajñaḥ pṛthivīṃ dhārayanti* Brahman, bearing and sustaining the earth enables her to be a firm seat for man. AV 13, 1, 33 (addressed to the sun) *ghṛtenārkam abhy arcanti vatsaṃ brahma santaṃ brahmaṇā vardhayanti* (see also TaittBr 2, 8, 8, 9 where the words *b. s. b. v.* also occur) "with ghee they pronounce the songs of praise unto the young; him, being b., they increase with b." And to wind up these quotations, the ŚatBr., 3, 9, 1, 11 states that by means of b. Prajāpati again strengthened himself, and from the same work, 5, 3, 3, 5 it follows that b. is able to ripen wild rice.

Charpentier [7]) has tried to show that the 'secondary meaning' "Zauberritus", which, according to his opinion, is the commonest sense of the word in the RV., also best suits the frequent use of *bráhman-* in association with the verb *kṛ-* [8]) ("Zauberriten ausführen") There are, indeed, some passages where such an interpretation (apart from the unjustified "Zauber") would do, as it will in other cases: 7, 103, 8, where the frogs, being regarded as soma-pressing brahmans "have raised their voice (*vācaṃ akrata*), *brahma kṛṇvantaḥ parivatsarīṇam* "performing their yearly rite". Taking into account the other passages, I feel, however, inclined to interpret the phrase by "to generate, to activate" the particular power which goes by the name of b. and which, in the form of, or concentrated in sacral words or rites, is held to strengthen the gods [9]) Some examples, which could be multiplied, will suffice to show that *kṛ-* is often associated with words expressing potencies or 'Daseinsmächte': RV 6, 51, 7 *mā va eno anyakṛtaṃ bhujema* "let us not atone for the sin committed by others"; 7, 88, 6 *āgāṃsi kṛṇavat*; AV 14, 2, 59 ss. *agha-* + *kṛ-* "to commit evil"; RV 1, 114, 2 *mayas* "enjoyment", 10, 44, 4 *ojaḥ kṛṣva saṃ gṛbhāya tve*; 10, 68, 12 (which is the closing stanza of the sūkta) *idaṃ akarma namaḥ*. We similarly find *jinv-* "to make active, impel, animate" (*brahma* RV. 8, 35, 16, TBr. 1, 1, 1, 1, where also *iṣaṃ, ūrjaṃ* etc.), *īr-* "to cause to rise etc." (RV 7, 23, 1), and RV 7, 31, 11 *indrāya brahma janayanti*; "to bring strength and might in b." (PañcBr 2, 8, 2) [10]) It is well known that such 'powers' as sin, honour, etc., which were regarded as having a physical existence, could be generated or set in motion. And as to brahman, BhagG. 3, 15 clearly states that "it is eternally based on worship" (*yajñe pratiṣṭhitam*), worship keeping up the world's pattern and structure, and generating or activating the powers for good in the universe.

The brahmáns are, on the other hand, able to make a vardhanam: ṚV. 1, 80, 1 *itthā hi soma in made brahmā cakāra vardhanam*, not unlike men in possession of qualifications for the exercise of magic in other parts of the earth, who get energy or potency to work for the benefit of their clients, and who are able to wield the 'inherent potentiality' of spells, charms, rites etc., which, though being generally automatic in action, is usually subject to the control of those who know how to use it, and the efficacy of which is held to depend upon the operator's occult power and that of the powerful words he is able to formulate. Thus 7, 22, 7 the 'operator' says *tubhyed imā savanā śūra viśvā tubhyam brahmani vardhanā kṛnomi*. he "makes" for Indra all these soma-libations as well as the strengthening brahmāni; cf. also 10, 49, 1; 6, 23, 6, 1, 47, 2

The word is rather often used in the concluding stanza in which the poet in a more or less recapitulative manner states that he has achieved something which must be of value to the god, from whom a boon may now be expected in return (cf e g 1, 12, 11) 1, 61, 16 the Gotamas have made a b for Indra *suvṛktī* "by means of a hymn of praise" (here *b* and *suvṛktī* can scarcely be synonymous), 2, 39, 8 (cf. 1, 165, 11); 1, 88, 4[11]) See also 1, 31, 18 *etenāgne brahmanā vāvrdhasva* Here *b* = *sūkta*-[12]) Further 4, 16, 21; 1, 117, 25; 5, 29, 15, etc 6, 35, 3 the subject of the phrase *viśvapsu b. kṛnavah* is Indra, from whom the poet expects an inspiration See, moreover, 1, 10, 4; 10, 141, 6 4, 16, 20 is of interest, because here the simile "*b* has been 'made' like a chariot", in which elsewhere the verb *takṣ*- "to form (by carving out of wood)" is used, is expressed by means of the verb *kṛ*-. The verb *takṣ*-, which may be associated with various objects is more than once used to express the idea of creating or fashioning such concepts or potencies like *sahas* (1, 51, 10), *vayas* (1, 111, 1). *nāman*- (5, 33, 4). 3, 54, 12 the Ṛbhus, who are distinguished by their skill, are said to have '*takṣ*-' the sacrifice (*adhvara*-) The powerful sacral word is fashioned like a cart: 1, 130, 6 *imām te vācam* . *āyavo ratham na dhīrah svapā ataksisuh* (cf also 5, 2, 11 *stomam* etc ; 10, 39, 14), and, in a similar way, 5, 73, 10 *imā brahmāni vardhanāśvibhyām santu śamtamā* / *yā takṣāma rathāṁ ivāvocāma bṛhan namah*; cf 10, 80, 7; 1, 62, 13. 5, 29. 15 both verbs (*kr*- and *takṣ*-) are found. Perhaps an allusion is made to magic accompanying the construction of carts or the simile has been prompted by the idea that formulas like carts bear (a formula 'bears' power) and carry (the power) towards a goal.

As can be gathered from passages in the AV. brahman was under

certain circumstances held to contain a curative or healing power: AV. 1, 23, 4 "Of the bone-born leprous spot, and of the body-born that is in the skin, of that made by the *dūṣi* ("spoiler") — by b. have I made the white mark disappear". whatever translation[13]) we adopt, it is a fact that by means of b. a curative, i.e. a restoring, maintaining, supporting process is held to take place. Cf. also 2, 10, 1 "I make you free from *āgas* ("guilt") by b." See also ṚV. 10, 162, 2 and such texts as AitBr. 1, 19, 1 and 3. The ŚatBr. 3, 9, 1, 11 explicitly states that one can become strong by means of b. The same text, 5, 1, 4, 11 ss., describes the winning of *vāja-* ("vigour, speed, energy") in the horses by means of brahman and with Bṛhaspati's cooperation. And 1, 2, 1, 7 it calls b., like kṣatram, a *vīryam* "power, energy". Brahman is that by which the gods became immortal (11, 2, 3, 6). There are, however, texts, in which b. in some way or other appears as an underlying or fundamental power: AV. 1, 32, 1 *mahad brahma vadiṣyati / na tat pṛthivyām no divi yena prāṇanti vīrudhaḥ*; Charpentier[14]) seems to be right in identifying *tat* "by which the plants breathe, which is not on earth nor in the sky", and *brahma*.

Brahman is called an "inner defence or bulwark" against evil powers, enemies etc.: *brahma varma mamāntaram* (AV. 1, 19, 4; 5, 8, 6; RV. 6, 75, 19). In this connection, too, b. is a stand-by. See also AV. 8, 2, 25. AV. 9, 2, 16 b. is called an "extended defence, made impenetrable" (*b. varma vitatam . .*) However difficult it may be to find the particular connotations expressed by b. in such contexts as 3, 8, 2 where the sacrificial post is addressed . . *brahma vanvāno ajaram suvīram*, the adjective points to undecaying firmness. Elsewhere brahman is a connecting potency. TaittS. 1, 5, 4, 3 by means of b. the sacrifice, which has been cut up by removing Agni from his place, is put or bound together (*saṃdadhāti*). Brahman is also the wood, the matter out of which heaven and earth are constructed (TBr. 2, 8, 9, 6—7).

I now draw special attention to the fact that in all periods of Indian literature brahman is frequently called imperishable, immovable, firm, that it is regarded as a sustaining principle, as a basis, support or firm and ultimate ground of existence. At all events, the words *brahmaṇā śālāṃ nirmitām* "the house built by means of b." (AV. 9, 3, 19) show that b. could be regarded as a power conducive to founding a house well[15]). In the hymns 10, 7 and 8 of the AV., which are nearly related to each other, brahman is represented as skambha[16]). The term *skambha-* "prop, support, fulcrum, pillar" is used in these hymns to designate the fulcrum or frame of the universe. The skambha has

entered the existent, but part of it "lies along that which will exist"; in the skambha are both the existent and the non-existent, in it earth, atmosphere, sky are set, in it fire, moon, sun, wind stand fixed; in it "both immortality and death are set together in man"; in the skambha the worlds, tapas and ṛta are placed, "the skambha sustains (*dādhāra*) both heaven and earth here; the skambha sustains the wide atmosphere; the skambha sustains the six wide directions, into the skambha this whole existence (*bhuvana*-) has entered" (7, 9, 10; 12, 15; 29, 35). These hymns, which appear to be an effort to formulate in a more subtle way than had been possible thus far the ultimate foundation of things, an effort to reach farther than the grounds or principles going by the names of brahman and puruṣa (cf. 10, 7, 10 and 11, where brahman is enumerated among a number of entities that are in the skambha; 19), wind up with a statement which presents the knowledge of brahman and ātman as the deepest insight into the ultimate ground of the universe, which at the same time delivers us from the fear of death (10, 8, 43 s.), the author, moreover, expressly argues that whoever knows the bráhman in man, knows the parameṣṭhin (the most exalted one, the supreme being) and whoever knows the parameṣṭhin .. knows the skambha, finally, Deussen's interpretation of the line *tasmai jyeṣṭhāya brahmaṇe namaḥ*, which recurs at the end of the stanzas 10, 7, 32, 33; 34; 36; 8, 1, is the most satisfactory given: "to him, (who is) the highest bráhman be homage", "him" referring to the theme of 7, 1—8, 2, viz. the skambha. It is, therefore, beyond doubt that these 'hymns', which emphasize the idea that ultimate Reality (or by whatever name the inexpressible might be designated) is a foundation, a basis, a support, do not hesitate to identify skambha and brahman, the term ātman, to be met with in the very end of this important text, shows that it leads up to the fundamental identification of Upaniṣadic thought. It would carry us too far to go over the whole of the text, let it suffice to quote only 8, 1 and 2 in full: "He who 'stands over' ('superintends') both what is and what is to be and everything, and whose only is light, to whom, (who is) the highest brahman, be homage. By the skambha these two are supported (and at the same time kept apart), both sky and earth; in the skambha (is) all this that is possessed of a 'soul' (*ātmanvat*), that which breathes and winks".

Another effort to formulate the idea that there must be an ultimate ground or basis of all things resorts to an image derived from textile art. "Yājñavalkya", said Gārgī Vācaknavī, "since all this world is

woven, warp and woof, on water, on what then is the water woven, warp and woof?" and the tenth answer to the ninth question following these words, is "on the world of brahman, O Gārgī" (BrhadĀrUp 3, 6): this world and all the worlds, including that of Indra and that of Prajāpati, are woven, warp and woof on (the world of) brahman Then, the same philosopher argues that that which is above the sky and that which is beneath the earth, that the past and the present and the future are woven on space; space, in its turn, is woven on the Imperishable (*etad vai tad akṣaram . brāhmaṇā abhivadanti* "that brahmans call the Imperishable"). At the command of that Imperishable the sun and the moon stand separately (*vidhṛtau tiṣṭhataḥ* "ont leur existence propre" Senart), the rivers flow etc. He who departs from this world without knowing that Imperishable is pitiable; but he who departs knowing it is a brahman At the beginning and the end of this section Yājñavalkya's explanations are called a brahmodyam "discussion about brahman" (BrhadĀrUp 3, 8; cf. also MaitriUp 6, 3, 7, 7) It is clear that this ultimate warp of the world, the unqualified and unconditioned Imperishable, which Yājñavalkya does not attempt to describe, since it is beyond all earthly distinctions, is brahman. The same term *otam* ("woven"), derived from the art of stringing and weaving is found MundUp 2, 2, 5 · "He on whom the sky, the earth the mind, together with all the vital breaths are woven, him alone know as the ātman" In the same context, however, we find other explanations (to which we will return at once) representing brahman as the ultimate basis, but using different 'metaphors' Śaṅkara, VS 1, 3, 1 elaborately argues that that on which the heaven, the earth etc. are woven, is brahman

It would serve no useful purpose to go over all the passages which could be adduced to demonstrate that this turn of speech remained popular. cf. e g. BhāgPur 9, 7, 7 Rudra, the soul of all beings that are possessed of a soul, *yasminn otam idam protam viśvam sūtre tantuṣu*. See also e g. BhagGītā 7, 7 where Kṛṣṇa says. *mayi sarvam idaṃ protam sūtre maṇigaṇā iva*: God holds together all existences of the world even as the string holds the gems. VāyuPur 4, 16 brahman is called *lokatantra-* "warp or frame of the world"

The same idea that the ultimate reality is a basis, a resting-place, a foundation is expressed in various other ways. ṚV 10, 121, 1 and 4 Hiranyagarbha, the one divine being, in whom are summed up the duties of creator, of ruler, and preserver of the universe, bears the earth and the sky; "by him" they are fixed (*dṛḍha-*), by him the

celestial light and the firmament are established or supported (*stabhita-*) He is *sthāṇurūpa-*, i e he has the form or appearance of a post or pillar (which is a 'symbol' of motionlessness): ŚivaPurDhs 51, 8. AV. 10, 8, 6 this all is set in (the ultimate basis, the skambha), there is established that which stirs and breathes *tatredaṃ sarvam ārpitam ejat prāṇat pratiṣṭhitam*; 7, 14 the first-born seers, verses .. the great one (*mahī*) are fixed (*ārpita-*) in the skambha; 12 earth, atmosphere etc are *ārpitāḥ* in the same basis; 1 the author puts the question as to the members of the skambha in which tapas is situated (*adhi tiṣṭhati*), ṛta is deposited (*adhyāhitam*) etc., cf also st 22 (and see above) As is well known, these texts again and again recur to the idea that one entity or potency is *pratiṣṭhita-* "situated, founded, established, fixed" in another See e g AV 19, 54, 4 "In time the gandharvas and apsarases are established, in time the worlds", and then, 53, 9, "Time becoming brahman, bears the paramesthin", 11, 4, 1 in *prāṇa-* ("breath") all stands firm; 15 "In breath what has been and what will be, in breath is all established", 17, 9 "In the non-existent is the existent made firm, in the existent is *bhūta-* ("being") made firm etc", 10, 7, 30 Further, RV 10, 85, 1 begins by stating that the earth is established by Reality or Truth (*satyenottabhitā bhūmiḥ*), that the Ādityās stand by the rta (*ṛtenādityās tiṣṭhanti*), that the same gods are strong by soma, by which also the earth is great, soma itself, however, is placed (*āhitaḥ*) in the lap of the asterisms The subject of fixing and fastening the sky, the earth and other parts of the universe is, indeed, again and again touched upon in the ṚV Compare also ŚatBr 7, 4, 1, 6; 11, 1, 6, 1 and 6, 7, 1, 17: in the beginning the universe was water, and these worlds are (therefore) established in water.

Hiranyadan Baida taught that the sky is established on the atmosphere, the atmosphere on the earth, the earth on the water, the water on Reality, Reality on brahman, brahman on tapas (AitBr. 3, 6, 4) The ŚatBr., which declares brahman to be a source of *vīryam* "manly power, vigour, energy" (cf e g. 5, 4, 4, 9), says that it upholds heaven and earth (8, 4, 1, 3): *brahmaṇā dyāvāpṛthivī viṣṭabdhe* Then MuṇḍUp 2, 2, 2 expounds that "that which is shining, which is subtler than the subtle, on which the world(s) are (is) set and their (its) inhabitants, that is the imperishable (*akṣaraṃ*) brahman" The knowledge of brahman is, accordingly, the foundation of all knowledge (id 1, 1, 1). "All this is founded on knowledge, knowledge is the foundation, brahman is knowledge" (AitBr. 5, 3). And when it is stated that

brahman, from which the gods emanated and which is "name" and "form" of all things (ŚatBr 11, 2, 3, 1 ss.), was in the beginning, this can but refer to its being pre-eminently fundamental Compare also such texts as TaittUp. 3, 1

In addition to the texts already adduced some other passages (which could be multiplied) will suffice to show that Vedic man was deeply concerned about a firm ground to rest upon, for sky and earth, for himself, for the universe. the word *pratisthā* "ground, resting-place, basis, support" is to be found with many associations RV. 5, 47, 7, e g, Mitra, Varuna and Agni are addressed in this way. *tad astu* .. *śam yor asmabhyam idam astu śastam / aśīmahi gādham uta pratisthām namo dive brhate sādanāya.* In ritual texts the touching of the earth which is a safe standing-place (*pratisthā*) is a means to procure such a ground (see ŚatBr 1, 9, 1, 29). "He should chant the last (verse) with the sounds (i.e after the manner) of the rathantara; the r. is the earth, he thereby retains a firm support on the earth" (PañcBr 6, 8, 18) See also such texts as AV. 19, 11, 6; PañcBr 5, 5, 8 etc etc "All creatures here, my dear", Uddālaka said to his son (ChUp 6, 8, 4), "have Being (*sat*) as their root (*mūla-*), have Being as their support (*āyatana-*), have Being as their ground (*pratisthā*)" [16a])

It would, therefore, be easy to understand if the ancient Indian searchers for a firm ground or foundation for the universe, the human soul included, had chosen a word derived from the root *brh-* "to be firm, strong etc." to designate that ultimate foundation of all that exists Anyhow, it is a fact that the concept of a support, that is a fundamental principle on which everything rests, and the ideas of firmness and immovability are often expressed in connection with brahman or with God who is brahman [17]) AitBr 7, 19, 3 the sacrifice is established (*pratisthitaḥ*) in brahman, in the brahmans (cf 4, 11, 1); PañcBr 13, 3, 2 "He firmly establishes the sacrifice in brahman"; ŚatBr 10, 2, 4, 6 the sun is established (*pratisthita-*) in b ; id 13, 5 4, 25 and 6, 2, 16 "he thus establishes himself finally in b" Brahman, Prajāpati's first creation, became to him a foundation (*pratisthā*), "hence they say "the Brahman (= the three Vedas) is the *pratisthā* of everything here" " (ŚatBr. 6, 1, 1, 8). Therefore, the text adds, "having studied the Veda one rests on a foundation, for this, the Veda, is one's foundation"

Brahman is the supreme imperishable or immutable (*aksaram brahma paramam*) the BhagGītā says (8, 3); "*brahma* is *akṣaram*" the epic and the purāṇic texts never tire of repeating (see e.g. Mbh. 1, 63, 100;

SauraPur 29, 33, 55, 12 *kūtastham acalam sūksmaṃ satyam nirgunam avyayam / ānandam aksaram brahma tāta jānīhi matpadam*; 32, 14 *brahma paramam jyotiḥ pratisthāksaram avyayam*; Īśvarag 2, 19, etc. etc) The term aksara, too, is already in the oldest prose Upaniṣads used as a denomination of the highest metaphysical principle [18]). And the Brahmasūtras expressly state (1, 3, 10) that brahman is the aksara, the imperishable, because it supports everything up to *ākāśa-* ("space"); *aksaram ambarantadhrteḥ*, cf BrhadĀrUp 3, 8, 8 *etad vai tad aksaram . brāhmanā abhivadanti* "the brahmans call this *aksara-*" and 11 *etasmin nu khalv aksare .. ākāśa otaś ca protaś ca* "in that aksara is the ākāśa woven, woof and warp" "This attribute of supporting everything, even the ākāśa, the first entity in the order of creation, can be true only of Brahman" [19])

Brahman is *dhruva-* "fixed, immovable, firm, permanent"; e g. Mbh 12, 224, 49 *manyante dhruvam evainam ye janās tattvadarśinah* (*dhruvam . upādhidharmāsparśinam* Nīlakantha). Brahman is said to be "the dwelling-(resting-) place of all that is divided into parts, eternal (*śāśvatam*), firm, imperishable" (Īśvarag 3, 5, cf. 7, 2; 9, 7) Gods, who are identified with brahman, lika Śiva and Visnu are called Dhruva, so is, of course, Brahmā Mbh 1, 63, 101 Viṣṇu is spoken of as *dhruvāksara-* To the same gods such epithets as *lokabhrt-* "supporting the world" are applied (Brahmā · KālPur 48, 66); Īśvarag 4, 19 the Lord (Śiva) declares himself *ādhārabhūtaḥ sarvaśaktīnām* "the support or substratum of all divine energies" The goddess Devī, the Mother of the world and Queen of the Universe is addressed as "Support (*ādhāra-*) of the world" (MārkPur 91, 3). Nothing but the Supreme is *nirādhāra-*. The highest principle is *ātmādhāraḥ* "supporter of the soul" (see e g Īśvarag 11, 63). According to the ŚvetUp (1, 8) the Lord (*īśa*) supports (*bharate*) this all, the perishable and imperishable, the manifest and the not manifest, and the Gītā (15, 17) teaches that the Lord, the Supreme Self *lokatrayam āviśya bibharti* "enters the three worlds and sustains them" The very words *āviśya bibharti* might be used to paraphrase the meaning of the verb *bṛṃhayati* (see above) BrahmaSu 3, 3, 23 the term *saṃbhṛti-* "the supporting (viz of the universe)" is used in connection with brahman.

According to Vedantic thought brahman is the *āyatana-* "support, resting-place" of heaven, earth etc (BrahmaSū. 1, 3, 1 *dyubhvādyāyatanam*), the basis of truth on which the world-appearance rests. Its being a place of rest (Sankara, on VedSū. 1, 1, 22) agrees with its being the highest cause and ultimate goal In Vijñānabhikṣu's philosophy brah-

man is the *ādhāra-*, the container, basis, ground of the universe in which it exists as undivided and as indistinguishable from it and which also holds the universe together [20]) In the state of dissolution (pralaya) the universe exists in a potential condition in brahman. Mbh 12, 233, 17 *evam sarvāṇi bhūtāni brahmaiva pratisamcaraḥ* Let us, finally, recall to memory the well-known philosophical term *adhiṣṭhāna-* "basis or abiding substratum": Śankara, e g, regards the *adhiṣṭhāna-* as the basis of all changes which are unreal in themselves, and this *adhiṣṭhāna-* is the brahman itself This term, too, occurs already in the ancient texts: when the creation of the universe by Viśvakarman (to whom these passages attribute the highest position) is described, the author asks what was the *adhiṣṭhānam*, what the *ārambhanam* "place of seizing, handle", whence (standing on which) [Viśvakarman "the all-maker" produced heaven and earth (RV 10, 81, 2) The creator himself is in want of a firm ground But the man who is in possession of b., the *brahmanvat*, suffers no wrong, is not lost (*na riṣyati*): AitBr 1, 13, 4; 29, 2 etc.

It should be remembered that the term brahman is sometimes applied to the so-called lower nature [21]) BhagG. 14, 3 and 4 *mahad brahma* must be understood as prakṛti. This brahman which, like the brahman that is born or produced (cf MuṇḍUp 1, 1, 9), reminds us the "dingliches Dasein" (Von Glasenapp) [22]) of the ancient "Daseinsmächte", is also regarded as a fundamental concept Similarly the brahman which is regarded as or identified with food (see e g TaittUp 2, 2 and Sāyana's interpretation *annam*) [23]). cf also such statements as PañcBr 12, 4, 20 "When a person eats food, he is internally supported (*viṣṭabdhaḥ*)" [24]).

[Whilst explaining in his work on the Vedāntasūtras the passage 1, 3, 8 "the [*bhūman-* (is brahman) .". Śankara tries to show that the bhūman referred to in ChUp 7, 23 (*yo vai bhūmā tat sukham* etc) is brahman. "Where one sees nothing else", the Upaniṣad says (7, 24, 1), "hears nothing else, understands nothing else, that is bhūman..." "The word *bhūman-* taken by itself", Śankara remarks (1, 3, 8), "means the state of being *bhū-* according to its derivation as taught by Pāṇ. 6, 4, 158; and *bhūman-* can mean the Highest Self only" (cf the Upanisad *yo vai bhūmā tad amṛtam* "bh. is the same as the immortal"). "It rests", according to ChUp 7, 24, 1, "on its own greatness". "The quality of being the bhūman, which quality is plenitude (*vaipulya-*), agrees moreover best with the Highest Self, which is the cause of everything".

Renou[25]) has recently drawn attention to the fact that brahman/Brahmā and Vāstospati are occasionally mentioned together, and, in a hesitating manner made the suggestion that this Vāstospati is bráhman as *kṣetrajña-*, i.e. the ātman of later philosophical speculation. I would rather ask myself, whether this juxtaposition of b. and V. may not be interpreted as a reminiscence of b./B. as a supporting power. There is, to my mind, no sufficient reason to suppose that in this connection Vāstospati is anything else but the spirit resident in the house or, rather, in the spot on which the house is built[26]), who is invoked to afford protection and to bless man and beast. When the house is complete, an offering is made to Vāstospati, which, according to some authorities, has to be repeated every year[27]); on that occasion brahmans are fed and expected to wish good luck for the place. Is this feeding of the human representatives of brahman[28]) not, like the well-known feeding of brahmans at rites in general[29]) and the bali for Brahmā to be presented together with an offering for Vāstospati in the centre of the house, is this not, I repeat, a strengthening of the brahman potency? ṚV. 8, 17, 14 V. is called "a firm pillar" (*dhruvā sthūṇā*) and 10, 61, 7 where the gods fashioned him, along with brahman, he is spoken of as "the observer of ordinances" (*vratapā*), an epithet elsewhere applied to Agni, who is also known as brahmán.

V.

In this connection it would not be improper to make some remarks here on the word *brahmán-*[1]). It need hardly be mentioned that as to the 'original meaning' of this term also scholars have often disagreed. In accordance with the views one holds about *bráhman-*, the *brahmán-* is a "Beter, Andächtiger und dann Beter von Beruf, d.h. Priester, Brahmane"[2]), or "nothing more than the sorcerer and medicine-man"[3]), a magician or "Zauberer"[4]), or "der mit (Wachstums)zauber vertraute Mann"[5]).

Although it would be of no consequence to go over a large number of passages to expound the views the ancient Indians themselves held about the nature and character of the brahmán, some texts may be quoted here, in which the brahmán was, essentially, supposed to be bráhman, or to represent it. It is interesting to observe that the identity of the human brahmán and the 'metaphysical' bráhman is clearly borne out by such ritual precepts as the following: when a person is seriously

ill, a rite may be performed on his behalf, during which the brahmán catches hold of the right hand of the yajamāna, being himself touched by the other priests, who muttering mantras perform a circumambulation round the yajamāna[6]) "Weshalb der Brahman angefasst wird, während die Priester um den Kranken herumgehen: der Brahman ist ja das Brahman (der heilige Zauber); durch das Brahman (das ja dem Brahman gleich steht) verleihen sie dem Yajamāna mit einem Male (nicht teilweise) das Leben"[7]). The brahmán is, indeed, repeatedly identified with the bráhman, cf e g ŚatBr 5, 1, 1, 11 "The brahman is the brahman" (*brahma hi brāhmaṇaḥ*); 1, 5, 2; 4, 8; 11; PañcBr 25, 18, 4; JaimBr n° 75 (Caland, Auswahl) See also such texts as ŚatBr. 13, 1, 5, 3 and 13, 2, 6, 9 "The brahmán relates to Bṛhaspati, Brhaspati being bráhman" According to Caland's translation[8]) the formula *brahman brahmāsi* (ĀpŚrS 3, 20, 7) means. "O Brahman, du bist das Brahman" In the same Sūtra (11, 15, 1) the seat of the brahmán is addressed with the formula *brahmajyotir asi suvardhāma* "You are the container of brahman-splendour, abiding in celestial light" ("der im Himmel Wurzelnde", Caland, = TS 1, 3, 3, 1) In the AitĀr (1, 2, 2) Vasukra, the reputed composer of ṚV. 10, 27—29, is explicitly identified with brahman: "True is this day and perfect its form as endowed with truth This sūkta is composed by V. V indeed is brahman, and this day is b " (*brahma vai Vasukraḥ* .). "So among the gods bráhman appeared by means of Agni, among men as a brahmán", the BrhadĀrUp says (1, 4, 15) "The brahman is everything" (ŚatBr 13, 6, 2, 19)[9])

The incomparable character of the brahman may also be understood from such passages as. "The very birth of a brahman is an eternal incarnation of the dharma" (Manu 1, 98) The epic often repeats that the brahman is better than another, that he is very powerful and dangerous: cf. e g. Mbh 3, 303, 16 ss "a brahman is the highest tejas (power, energy), the brahman is the highest tapas (power of ascetism); it is by the honouring of brahmans that the sun shines in the sky"; "having prowess consisting in truth, and gifted with great energy (*ugrāh*[10])), such men, if enraged, are capable of reducing the entire kingdom to ashes by their 'magic incantations' (*abhicāraiḥ*), their craft and even by the mere power of their will" (13, 33, 8); "there is nothing that can destroy their power, which is capable of reaching the ends of the universe" (9); "being older in respect of their origin than the pitaras, the gods, etc, they cannot be defeated by these groups of beings" (15 s.); "they are able to make a godhead, that is not a god"

(17); "there is nothing higher than a brahman" (34, 5); "by birth alone he is an object of worship to all creatures" (35, 1); "in consideration of the world the Creator created (emanated) the brahmans in order to rescue all the worlds, among all mortal beings they are gods on earth" (141, 61), "it is those wise men who uphold all the worlds" (this interesting statement is found 13, 151, 3 *te hi lokān imān sarvān dhārayanti manīṣiṇaḥ*), they are the *nidhānam* "place of rest" of all beings, the *praṇetāraś ca lokānāṃ śāstrāṇāṃ ca* "the guides (or authorities) of the whole world and the authors (promulgators) of the authoritative books" (5); "enraged, they can create other worlds than those existing" (16); "they are the gods of the gods and the cause of all causes" (i.e. the bráhman; 18), "they are the authority of all authorities" (18), etc etc etc [11]) These quotations perfectly harmonize with the passages in the Dharma-texts dealing with the character and functions of the brahman he is a visible deity (ViSmrti 20, 20); he is in the possession of supernormal power (id 78, 10, 46). The brahman sustains the world (ViSmṛti 19, 21 *brāhmaṇair lokā dhāryante*); it is by his favour that the gods reside in heaven (id 22). A place where such an "eternally great" being sits is sacred (cf. BaudhDhś. 2, 5, 8, 2); on touching him one has to 'purify' oneself (ĀpDhś. 1, 5, 14); he himself remains always 'pure' (cf Manu 10, 102 s ; VāsDhś 27, 9); his word purifies (VāsDhś. 14, 24), he sanctifies a company [12]).

I add the following texts by way of showing that a later age did not abandon these views BhāgPur 5, 5, 22 Bhagavat, the Highest Being, expressly states, that the gods (*devāḥ*) are lower in the scale of divinity than Dakṣa and the other children of Brahmā, who are, however, inferior to Bhava (Śiva), who is not so high as Viriñca, who is inferior to Bhagavat himself, "whose gods are the brahmans (*aham dvijadevadevaḥ*) There are no other beings equal to brahmans (23), they bear or preserve (in this world) the "commanding body or manifestation" (*tanūr uśatī*; the participle perhaps expresses the idea of 'will-power'), which formerly belonged to the Highest Being Itself (*dhṛtā tanūr uśatī me purāṇī*; 24). As is well known, no greater crime exists than slaying a brahman.

That among the Buddhists *brāhmaṇa-* comes to be used as synonymous with *arhat-* "he who has attained the summum bonum" (see e.g. Dhammapada 383 ss.), and that among the Jains Mahāvīra is styled by this title is easily understood. This is in perfect agreement with the brahminical view that he who knows brahman becomes brahman [13]).

It need hardly be remarked that the idea that human beings are recipients of 'power' is not confined to India. Any Apache, for instance, is a 'potential recipient' of occult power. According to the Navaho all people have power for good or evil "in some measure", but there are people who possess "a good deal"[14]). Among some of the Bahnar tribes of Indo-China women only are believed to be in possession of so-called occult power, there designated by the term *deñ*, by virtue of which they act as 'magicians', in other tribes, however, only men have it. Among the Andamanese certain specially favoured persons are supposed to be endowed with supernormal powers, they, accordingly, are able to act as 'magicians' [15]). Just like the Indian brâhman the Siouan term *wakan* indicates a wonderful power with which the universe is believed to be charged, and just like brahman, wakan may be a formula or an object: a stone or stick can be wakan and then it is used as an amulet, a place, and it is used as a sacred grove, wakan can be a formula, and being recited it will accomplish what is inaccessible to the techniques of everyday routine. But it may also be persons of particular attainments or in particular circumstances that are wakan[16]). The Kwakiutl term *ᵋnáwălakʷ* has a very wide range of meaning. "Es kann rein persönlich gebraucht werden, aber ebensowohl eine Eigenschaft oder Kraft bedeuten, — gerade wie das Wort *manitou*, oder wie unser *heilig, der Heilige, Heiligkeit, Heiligtum*. Genauere Kenntnis der Bedeutung beweist, dass weder eine allgemeine Mana-Anschauung noch eine anthropomorphe Anschauung dem Begriffe zu Grunde liegt, sondern dass je nach den gegebenen Verhältnissen die eine oder die andere überwiegt" [17]) In contradistinction to the usual or ordinary and the profane *ᵋnáwălakʷ* is the general term to express the idea of 'das Übernatürliche, Wunderbare'. "Das Wort wird substantivisch gebraucht, um Wesen zu bezeichnen, die mit übernatürlichen Kräften ausgestattet sind" (e.g. trees, the lark, the salmon, supernatural beings that manifest in visions, twins, persons celebrating or joining in religious ceremonies etc.) "Häufig wird der Ausdruck auch attributiv gebraucht" (e.g. a *ᵋnáwălakʷ* woman, land, lake, leaf) "An andern Stellen wird das Wort gebraucht, um die übernatürliche Kraft des Wesens zu bezeichnen. So finden wir "die übernatürliche Kraft der Bäume, ... des Hauses des Menschenfressers ...". Dementsprechend redet man vom "Versuchen ü. K. zu gewinnen, ü. K. auszuüben" " The Ho, a Munda-speaking tribe of Chota Nagpur, believe in "a very big power", called *bona*, which pervades the universe and, though being formless by itself, can assume any form. It is often identified with the

object with which it is associated, thus, a river, a mountain, the sun are a boña It is possessed by both inanimate objects and animate beings to a greater or less extent Thus the differences in power, ability and influence between men are explained by their differing endowments of boña [18]) Among the Suau-Tawala (Papua) the term *gigiboi* not only applies to 'power' but also to things and persons in which this 'power' resides [19]) With many primitive peoples it is especially the king, who is the power bearer; upon "his majesty" a particular dignity or power is bestowed, which fuses with his own human will [20]) By many peoples smiths are regarded as wonder-workers, and their inherent power is often hereditary [21]) In south-eastern Australia, where each tribe consists of two exogamous intermarrying sub-groups, an 'occult power' is ascribed to members of one class which is injurious to those of the other. Among the Anula in the same continent, the capability of 'magical action' is hereditary in a definite group [22]) Many tribes of northern Nigeria ascribe particular powers to certain families. One family in a village may be able to control the weather, another to drive away locusts, and especially honoured is the family which possess the secrets of a good harvest [23]). What is true among various other peoples [24]), was also true among the ancient Indians The manifestation of bráhman among men was called brahmán [25]).

Hence the statement that he who knows the Imperishable is a brahman, for to know something on this level of civilization, means to have control over it, to be unified with it. BrhadĀrUp 3, 8, 10 *ya etad aksaram . viditvāsmāl lokāt praiti sa brāhmaṇaḥ* Cf. Nīlakaṇṭha on Mbh. 5, 42, 27 *te yoginah brāhmaṇāḥ sagunabrahmavida itah dehāt pretya gatva brahmaloke tejasvinah pūjyā bhavanti tato muktim ca brahmana saha prāpnuvanti.* "Who knows the gods eye to eye who themselves have intercourse with brahman, he may be a knower, a brahman", AV 10, 7, 24 says Renou [26]), while referring to AV. 4, 1, 3, where Vena is said to "have borne up the bráhman from the midst of the brahman (cf. the first stanza which states that he has unclosed the first born bráhman of old) and to speak of all the births of the gods", is right to point out that the "jātavidyā said by the brahmán" (ṚV 10, 71, 11) must be a designation for "the knowledge of the origins". The brahman, indeed, is in possession of the fundamental knowledge, he knows the fundamental power [27]) The wise brahman knows the four quarters (i e the whole) of Speech (ṚV. 1, 164, 45 = AV. 9, 10, 27); three, deposited in secret, he does not set in motion (i.e use) [28]), the fourth of speech human beings speak [29]) As Vâc is one of the two

aspects of the universal Being [30]), this verse, too, ascribes fundamental knowledge to the brahman. Only a brahman learned in the Vedas has, therefore, a right to the prerogatives of his class (VāsDhś. 3, 1 ss) The brahman is omniscient. *brahmā sarvavidyaḥ, sarvaṃ veditum arhati* (Yāska, Nir 1, 8) See also a passage like ŚatBr 11, 6, 2, 10 Hence also such assertions as "The brahmán must be born in the bráhman, full of pre-eminence in holy power" (Aśvamedha) [31]), which in its turn was "first born of old" [32]) Cf. AV 19, 22, 21 "Manly powers were gathered with bráhman as chief, b as chief in the beginning stretched the sky, the brahmán was born as first of creatures" [33]) Hence the brahman's divine character viz the brahman who has studied, being a human god, to be gratified with dakṣiṇās, is able to convey the donor to the celestial world (ŚatBr. 4, 3, 4, 4; 2, 2, 2, 6) [34]) Being entitled to receive honour and gifts, and to be exempt from oppression and the death penalty, he is sacrosanct [35]) His wife is inviolable (cf AV 5, 17, especially 8 and 9. this 'hymn', which in its entirety is an imprecation against him who dares to violate the wife of a brahmán begins, according to Whitney's interpretation, by speaking of an offence against bráhman *brahmakilbisa-*), his cow sacrosanct (AV. 5, 18 and 19) A cow with twin calves, being dangerous, should be given to him, "so would she be pleasant and propitious" (AV 3, 28, 2). he alone is fitted to be her master [36]) Like the gods he may be entitled *bhagavant-* (ŚatBr. 14, 6, 1, 2) [37]) He alone is allowed to eat the remnants of the sacrifice, for no one else is sufficiently 'sacer' to partake of the food of the gods (cf ŚatBr 2, 3, 1, 39) Brahmans are able to perform great deeds: RV 5, 31, 4 they impart power to Indra; 40, 8 the brahman Atri places the sun in the sky Of course, he "has made a strengthening" (ṚV. 1, 80, 1 *brahmā cakāra vardhanam*) [38]) No wonder that gods are often spoken of as brahmans Agni, who combines in himself the activities of the human priest, being the hotar, the adhvaryu, the brahman and the purohita of the gods, is a brahman; RV 2, 1, 2; 4, 9, 4; 7, 7, 5, etc. (2, 1, 3 b = Brahmanaspati = Agni [40])); Bṛhaspati RV 10, 141, 3, Soma is called the brahman of the gods ṚV 9, 96, 6; Indra, who RV 6, 45, 7 is styled a *b* *bráhmavāhas-*, also 8, 16, 7; the Maruts RV 5, 29, 3, where Sāyana explains *b* by *bṛhantaḥ*

But especial stress is laid on the brahman's knowledge of the structure of the universe, of the nature of the divine powers. ṚV 10, 107, 6, where, as is the case in other texts (TaittS 6, 6, 1, 4 etc), learning, and not physical descent, is regarded as the true criterion of brahman-

hood: learning, i.e. knowledge of the fundamental things See also ṚV. 10, 85, 16; 34, AV. 9, 1, 6; 12, 2, 39 The importance of study is often emphasized (e g ŚatBr 1, 7, 2, 3) Vāc makes a person brahman: ṚV 10, 125, 5 The b is "the highest firmament of speech" ṚV 1, 164, 35. "A speaking b is more liked than a silent one": 10, 117, 7; cf. also 9, 113, 6 etc Numerous passages state that the brahman's aim is to acquire *brahmavarcasa-* "pre-eminence in sacred knowledge", "spiritual lustre", "divine glory or splendour", "sanctity", "superhuman power", according to current translations. Elsewhere the authorities affirm that a brahman is born with "spiritual lustre" (*brahmavarcasa-*), ŚatBr 13, 1, 9, 1.

In addition to the preceding I would venture some remarks by way of determining as far as possible the character of the brahmán in ancient times While referring to my predecessors as to particulars [40]), I confine myself to the main features In my opinion, the brahmán was originally, as a member of the class of men called brahman, sacrosanct and powerful (this word to be taken in its literal sense) He, therefore, was, in virtue of his knowledge of formulas, of his mighty word, or even on the strength of his mere powerful presence, qualified for the exercise of various magical practices, magico-religious rites etc. His mere presence by means of the power with which he was endowed, often sufficed to avert evil influences, to maintain a rite in effective order, to exercise a 'healing' and strengthening influence. Hence his character as a purifier (see above), hence in all probability, the prescription (Manu 7, 75) that a fort must be supplied with brahmans [41]), hence the statement of the Brāhmanas (ŚatBr 1, 7, 4, 18) that the brahman sitting south of the sacrifice, is its guardian (*abhigoptā*), hence other 'negative' functions: AitĀr 3, 2, 3 *tasmād brahmānam brahmiṣṭhaṃ kurvīta yo yajñasyolbanam paśyet* "One should, therefore, choose a brahman who is brahman in a high degree and can discern flaws in the sacrifice". There is no sufficient reason to suppose [42]) that his rôle in the ritual as described in Vedic prose texts, viz. the guardianship to make atonement for the mistakes of the individual priests etc. does not date "from the beginning"

In general, a brahman only could be priest All members of the brahman families, according to their claims and qualifications, were, as far as we know, eligible to undertake the duties of a hotṛ, an udgātṛ, an adhvaryu etc, and in the ṚV brahman is, as a rule, the term to denote those who took upon themselves such a priestly office. In the course of time these terms hotṛ etc. indicating specialized offices came

to prevail over the general denomination, the latter being specially applied to those brahmans who were in the first place qualified and characterized by their being bráhman or a brahmán, by their being sacrosanct and powerful, and, of course, especially to the brahmans *κατ' ἐξοχήν* [13]) (or true brahmans), who were distinguished for their learning (cf e g the *vidvān brahmā* KausBr 6, 10 [11])). "The brāhmanas are the guardians (*prāvitārah*, lit "who favour, promote, protect") of this sacrifice", the ŚatBr. (1, 5, 1, 12) says, "for guardians of the sacrifice, indeed, are those brāhmaṇas who are experienced in the sacred writ, because they spread it (i e. perform it), they originate it .", and 1, 8, 1, 28 the same text has: "Those brāhmaṇas, who have studied and teach the Veda, indeed, promote (*avanti*) the sacrifice, since they spread (perform) it, they originate (produce) it . ." It was, among other things, the task of this brahman to apply his universal knowledge (cf TaittBr 3, 10, 11, 4) of the Veda to the superintendence of the sacrifice as a whole and to act as its physician (AitBr 5, 34, 2; KausBr 6, 12 *brahmani vai yajñaḥ pratiṣṭhito, yad vai yajñasya skhalitam volbaṇam vā bhavati brahmaṇa eva tat prāhus, tat sa trayyā vidyayā bhiṣajyati . . esa ha vai yajñasya vyṛddham samardhayati* and 14 . *śāntir eva bhesajam*) At the ritual this brahman pure and simple is he who possesses *sarvavidyā* (cf e g TaittBr 3, 10, 11, 4) [45]), i e. he who knows the Veda, religious knowledge or religion as a whole [46]). Since bráhman embraces the *trayī vidyā* and, besides, such matter as the esoteric understanding of the universe, of the nature of the divine powers and the sacrifice [47]), and since the *brahmatvam* "the office of the brahmán" proceeded from the essence of the three Vedas (see AitBr. 5, 32, 4), the brahmán, the mind of the sacrifice (ŚatBr 14, 6, 1, 7), is the living bearer of all that knowledge, of all that power [48]).

VI.

When this paper had almost entirely been written, Renou's important contribution to the solving of the riddle met my eyes [1]) Finding a great gap between 'the Ṛgvedic meaning' ("la valeur de "hymne" ou de "formule" qu'atteste le Ṛgveda dans son ensemble") and the sense of "universal principle", Renou argues that the first meaning, which he rightly calls an established fact, is for all that only an approximation, or a phraseological levelling of the ṚV , the bráhman concept is more comprehensive and, at the same time more definite: and this

meaning is, in his opinion, "(cosmic) enigma", or, rather "cette activité puissante qui par la voie de l' 'énigme' s'est aiguisée au service des grandes connexions" [2]). This meaning which is very clearly perceptible in the term *brahmodya-* "words (to be spoken) on b (or : being b.)" [3]) ("énoncé du brahman = devinette rituelle", "cosmic charade" Bloomfield), on which the author makes very valuable remarks, leads him to suggest that bráhman originally signified that very ritual-cosmic enigma and belonged to a root **brah- / *barh-* conveying the sense of "parler par énigmes".

While I cannot, to my regret, agree with this etymology which forces us into supposing the existence of an isolated root without considering the meaning of other words built upon the sounds *brh-*, I am convinced that the explanations given by Renou and my own views as expounded in this paper are essentially in harmony with each other I would, however, prefer not to regard "enigma" as the original meaning To my mind, brahman is a more or less definite power (the more specific connotations of which may be understood in some context or other), which often, and especially in the most ancient texts, manifests itself as word, as ritual (cf e g ŚatBr 3, 1, 4, 15 "the sacrifice is brahman"), sacred or magical word, etc The preponderance of this aspect of the brahman concept, of these special connotations, is closely bound up with the extremely important part played by the sacred word and by the speculations on vāc etc in these texts, a point Renou is quite right to emphasize [4]). But in my opinion brahman signified "enigma", because "word" means "power", that is to say, because the sacred word is a manifestation, one of the manifest aspects, of the potency called *bráhman-*, *bráhman-* and *brahmodya-* could have been used to convey the meaning "riddle, ritual-cosmic enigma", an enigma, too, being considered a manifestation of that power.

Many 'primitive' peoples are fond of riddles As long as modernization has not made great progress, propounding riddles is among them only partly a pastime, and first and foremost a social and religious activity of importance When the Toradjas (Central-Celebes), after having sowed, are in uncertainty as to the crops, they behave as quietly and austerely as possible in order not to make the invisible powers angry which control rain and sunshine At that time the recitation of literary products, too, is discontinued But as soon as the rice-ears swell and come out, the 'riddle-season' has come, because, according to the Toradjas, a riddle contains its solution, just as the ear contains the rice, and the 'drawing out' of the solution from the riddle is promotive of

the rice's appearing from the ear Every time a riddle has been solved the bystanders exclaim. "Come out, o rice!" When the rice has come out, the 'riddle-season' comes to an end Out of riddle-time this activity is forbidden, but during the season it is a religious duty, accompanied by sympathetic rites [5]) In Bare'e (one of the Toradja languages) the very verb by which the propounding of riddles is denoted, *mo-wailo,* seems to be derived from *wailo* "millet" and, therefore, primarily to have meant something like "to promote the growth of the millet, to take care of the m." [6])

The Malagasy term *hain-teny,* which has often been explained as "adage, proverb, repartee", is a designation for a kind of popular 'carmina' which, though often recited for amusement, owing to their authoritative character, have a serious function Such a 'carmen', which is also called *ankamantatra* "riddle", *ohatra* "example", *fampanononana* "questions énigmatiques qui appellent une réponse" [7]), is never complete by itself, but requires an answer "Elle suppose une rivalité, une hostilité réelle ou imaginaire qui doit se terminer par la victoire de l'un des deux rivaux" Now, the term literally means, according to Ferrand [8]), "puissance de la ou des paroles"

The custom of asking riddles at certain times and in certain ceremonies is also found in many other parts of the area inhabited by Indonesian peoples and in adjacent countries [9]) Among the Tobongko (Celebes) riddles are propounded at harvest and by watchers over a corpse [10]), with the Bolaang Mongondow they may not be asked except when there is a corpse in the village [11]) The latter use of enigmatical speech has not only been known in England [12]), but, according to Manu 3, 231, also in India *brahmodyāś ca kathāḥ kurvāt pitṝṇām etad īpsitam* [13]) Although this custom has, as far as I know, not yet been thoroughly investigated and elucidated, we might suppose that riddles and enigmatical dialogues were (and are) held to be conducive to the welfare of the dead and compare other kinds of ritual contests and combats on the occasion of death, marriage etc [14]), which, too, are regarded as producing sacred power and availing the dead [15]). Among the Bathonga, a Bantu tribe, riddles put by women to men (who have to answer in the most filthy language, obscene words being customary and auspicious on these occasions) form part of a rain-making ceremony [16])

The propounding of riddles itself was often a contest (compare the use of terms like *vīra-*, *ji-* etc. in connection with a brahmodya), and many a time it was serious enough to involve life and death [17]). The

solving of a difficult problem could be equivalent to a victory in a duel [18]), it puts the vanquished in the power of the victor, who proved able to solve the riddle The winning of a bride was in a similar way made to depend on the solution of a problem by the suitor He who solves it sweeps the stake, i e the maid herself. He conquers her by his knowledge, for the man who solves a riddle gets the object to be guessed into his power, because he has grasped its name, i e its essence and nature.

It was regarded as the characteristic of the wise or able man that he understood the riddle of the wise Hence the wisdom of such a man was put to test by rivals or authorities by means of riddles [19]) In the story in Mbh. 3, a 133, e.g, young Aṣṭāvakra, who is *vedaprabhāvena samanvitaḥ* and wishes to expound the *brahmādvaitam,* the brahman without duality, in a disputation with the famous Bandin, who is in possession of *vākyabalam,* is tested by the king by means of riddles before being admitted· "He alone is a really wise man (*paraḥ kaviḥ* [20])) who understands the thing that has thirty divisions . . .". After having answered three questions, Astāvakra, being regarded as a divine being, with whom no other can be compared as to wisdom, is given access "to destroy" Bandin In the literature of other peoples there are also many well-known examples of wise men, mystics etc., who in their speculative discussions propound riddles to each other [21]) Such discussions, which may strike modern man as a playful asking of more or less difficult questions and as an exercise in acuteness, are (like the Upaniṣads which they resemble) essentially attempts at pushing out into the unknown, at penetrating gradually into an important mystery, at finding the solution of fundamental truths and grasping the meaning of at least part of the great riddle [22]) By doing so these mystics make progress on their path, gain in knowledge and gain in power

Although a comprehensive investigation into the magico-religious functions of the riddle along modern lines is, as far as I know, still a desideratum, we might perhaps suggest that among the factors which gave it a sacred meaning were its character of being a contest (compare also the brahmodyas in the eleventh, book of the ŚatBr [23])), the magico-religious function of the ritual dialogue in general, the primitive belief that knowing the name of an object means hold over it, the no less primitive idea that speaking about a process is a substitute of the process itself, that speaking of power generates power The riddle which forces man to exert himself in order to find its solution must

itself be powerful or a source of power Moreover, the desire to keep important doctrines and sacred traditions secret from the incompetent, the wish not to state, from some reason or other, the truth or not to reveal wisdom in so many words, and, not to forget, the element of playfulness, a predilection for clever formulations, for the art of couching witty thoughts in a concise form have, no doubt, early tended to make the propounding of riddles a wide-spread phenomenon, as has the belief that the gods love the mysterious and unintelligible (ŚatBr 6, 1, 1, 2 etc.) Several peoples (e g Germans, ancient Iranians, cf., e g, also AV. 10, 7 and 8) liked to express their sacred lore in the form of questions and answers [24]). The one who thought out the formulation and propounded the question (or riddle) knew the answer (or solution) to it Thus many so-called riddles were, at least originally, no riddles proper, but a concise résumé of a mythological or cosmological doctrine or tradition Hence it becomes clear that many ancient 'riddles' of the Slavs, the Greeks, the Germans, the Indians are "wahre Weltratsel, die die grossen kosmischen Vorgange betreffen, deren Auflosung, wenn auch auf anderem Wege, sonst der Mythus versucht" [25]) The ritual propounding of riddles, to be found in such a developed form in the ancient Indian sacrifice, was certainly no mere repeating of questions and answers, no mere catechism, but a device to generate or to liberate sacred power, to get a hold on a potency.

So it would not be surprising if brahmodyas have, in a similar way, been attempts at formulating and grasping, in the outward form of 'enigmatical speech', the fundamental, all-pervading, all-connecting power or powers (cf. RV 8, 3, 9) underlying the unstable and transient phenomena, and at the same time attempts at having a hold on that power And the word bráhman had, in texts like RV. 1, 152, 5 and 6, AV. 10, 10, 23 [26]), the same meaning The man who was well versed in brahmodyas was, or became like Janaka (ŚatBr 11, 6, 2, 10) a brahmán, a bearer of bráhman (cf also TaitS 2, 5, 8). The well-formulated and well-solved brahmodya is a source of power: ŚatBr 13, 2, 6, 9 It may not be out of place here to note that the *vākovākyam* which was a special "theological discourse", similar to a brahmodya is called a honey-offering to the gods (ŚatBr 11, 5, 6, 8) and as such put on a level with the *itihāsapurāṇam*, the *gāthā nārāśaṃsyaḥ*, the *vidyāḥ* etc, which were regarded as means to activate power or to bestow it on gods or men [27]).

VII.

I cannot completely agree with the opinion, which may be called current, that Brahmā, the "god", is an "anthropomorphic personification of the Creator-Demiurge" [1]) or, briefly, a personification of bráhman [2]), or "die persönliche Gestalt, zu der man das Bráhman (neutr.) verdichtete" [3]). For, if we express ourselves in a similar way, we implicitly admit the chronological priority of the 'impersonal brahman'. And, to my mind, the Indian sources do not supply us with sufficient evidence to prove the absolute correctness of that assumption. It is, to begin with, clear that we cannot rely upon such Vedic texts as ṚV. 10, 129, which describes the creation of the Universe by stating that first of all there was no existent or non-existent, at the time, *ānīd avātam . . . tad ekam* "that one (neuter!) breathed (a process peculiar to living beings!) breathless", and "the gods come later than (or, rather, on this side of) this creation". What Radhakrishnan says may be true. "The unborn, the one, the eternal breaks forth into a self-conscious Brahmā with matter, darkness, non-being, zero, chaos opposed to it" [4]), there are, on the one hand, also other conceptions of creation: in other hymns of the same ṚV. several gods are in turn looked upon as the authors of the universe, — and, on the other hand, these texts are far from giving an historical account of the development of ancient Indian thought, they are not historiography. It is not even possible to show that ṚV. texts which present an impersonal first cause or ultimate substratum are older than those in which the method of creation is differently conceived.

From a text like ṚV. 10, 129, 2 *ānīd avātam . . . tad ekam* it is already clear that the ancient Indian thinkers did not draw a hard and fast line between the personal and the impersonal, the animate and the inanimate. In the ŚatBr. a curious passage (11, 2, 3, 1) says: "It (i.e. brahman, neuter) created the gods, having created them, it placed them in these worlds". In the same text, 13, 7, 1, 1 brahman (n.) is able to think and to perform tapas: *brahma vai svayambhu tapo 'tapyata. tad aikṣata: na vai tapasyānantyam asti. hantāhaṃ bhūtesv ātmānaṃ juhavāni.* 11, 3, 3, 1 the b. while delivering the creatures up to Death, is represented as speaking. See also similar passages in the GopathaBr. (1, 1) in which brahman thinks and creates by exerting itself in performing tapas, and JaimBr. (no. 160 Caland, Auswahl).

In this connection passing mention may be made of such texts as ŚatBr. 13, 6, 2, 8, where it is stated that Prajāpati, who is often the

supreme god who created heaven and earth is identical with brahman (see also 7, 3, 1, 42), the same Prajāpati who according to the Sūtras (see e.g. ĀGS. 3, 4 etc.) is identified with Brahmā

No more than those authors did the thinkers speaking in the oldest Upaniṣads go deeply into the question whether the ultimate Reality is personal or impersonal. It is not until we come to the so-called earlier metrical Upaniṣads that we find the problem as to the mutual relation of the 'impersonal' and the 'personal' 'aspect' touched upon In the BṛhadĀrUp (3, 7, 23) the personal ātmā is described in the same terms as the impersonal akṣaram (3, 8, 11) and to the latter attributes like that of "commanding" are ascribed[5]) 1, 4, 10 b (n.) knew only itself: "I am b.". "Which is the one god?" the interlocutor asks, BṛhadĀrUp 3, 9, 9; "Breath", said he, "they call him (masc.) brahman (n.), the Yon (n.): *katamo eko deva iti · prāṇa iti, sa brahma tyad iti ācakṣate* ŚvetUp 4, 1 s. God's oneness and immanence is expounded in the following way The One (*ekaḥ*, m.) . into whom, its end and its beginning, the whole world dissolves — He is God (*devaḥ*, m.) . That (*tad*, n.) surely is Agni (or fire), that is āditya (the sun) that surely is the pure, that is brahman (n.), that is the waters, that is Prajāpati (Lord of Creatures or of Creation)" The personal and the neutral idea of the Highest Reality are entirely intermingled, — we would say from the standpoint of a scientific philosopher who endeavours to keep both concepts apart Referring to the fact that in some Ṛgvedic hymns the Supreme is indifferently called He or It, Radhakrishnan rightly remarks that "the same formless, impersonal, pure and passionless being of philosophy is worshipped by the warm full-blooded heart of the emotional man as a tender and benevolent deity To meet the demands of both popular religion and philosophy, the Absolute Spirit is indiscriminately called He or It We need not put this down to a conscious compromise of theistic and monistic elements or any elusiveness of thought"[6]) Several authors have, of course, already pointed out similar "Vorstellungen, die in der Tat in begreiflicher Unbestimmtheit schwebten"[7]). The many examples quoted by Von Glasenapp make it clear that "ein genereller Unterschied zwischen Belebtem und Unbelebtem, zwischen Persönlichem und Unpersönlichem für die Verfasser der Brāhmaṇas noch nicht besteht Jeder Potenz wird mehrfach in der einen oder anderen Weise vorgestellt werden"[8]). Hence it follows that Brahman cannot be "ein rein geistiges und unpersönliches Wesen" either[9]).

Although it would lead too far to go into details, some parallels

known to ethnologists and historians of religion must be mentioned. Among the Nilotic tribe of the Lango's "anything strikingly unusual or supernatural in character is commonly attributed to Jok and is said to be 'god-like'" [10]) Jok, who is now a high god, is known under a variety of names and titles, corresponding to his different activities and manifestations. Actually, however, he is considered an indivisible entity permeating the universe. "The conclusion would seem to be irresistible" Webster [11]) says, "that Jok is no more than mana personified". Natives of Nyasaland (East Africa) call anything beyond the range of their understanding *mulungu* [12]); it usually denotes an inherent quality or property, but, on the other hand, Mulungu is spoken of as having made the world, man, and animals. Among other tribes of Nyasaland the term refers to all that appertains to the spirit world, including a deity; the word itself, however, belongs to an impersonal class of nouns. Among the Wabena of Tanganyika the 'personal' and the 'impersonal' conception of mulungu are often so "inextricably mingled", that in the same context it is spoken of as a person who will render help and as a medicine. Here mulungu is an "impersonal ambivalent force" that pervades everything but may be associated with certain things or persons. As to the Masai (Tanganyika), their conception of the deity is so vague, that according to one author *nai* is, for them, whatever strikes them as strange or incomprehensible, according to another, however, it is an all-powerful, all-knowing, omnipresent, and eternal incorporeal being [13]). Moreover, the natives themselves often do not speculate about power or powerful beings [14]). The Algonquian term *manitou*, by itself "has no implication as to whether it is personal or impersonal, but it becomes one or the other according as it is given the personal or impersonal gender of the Algonquian languages. . It means either supernatural power in the abstract, or a Supernatural Power. . A manitou means not only a supernatural being but a holy man, a religious practitioner" [15]). And *ma'at*, the ancient Egyptian concept of 'justice' or 'equity' is not only a goddess, but at the same time "that by which the gods live" [16]).

Under the circumstances it would appear to me that scholars have often attached too much value to the well-known argumentum e silentio: in the oldest Vedic texts [17]) the god Brahmā does not occur. But does the fact, that the authors of the RV. etc. do not or not clearly mention a personal Brahmā mean that to other circles and groups of ancient Indian society existing at the same time the personal aspect of brahman was entirely unknown? The authors of the ṚV. are, like

those of other Vedic texts, only representative of part of their contemporaries, of definite aspects of the spiritual life of ancient India. It is highly probable that other groups than those brahmanical priest-families speaking in most hymns of the ṚV and the Atharvanic magicians held 'unorthodox', 'unofficial' views [18]). Moreover, there are the much-discussed differences in Eastern and Western beliefs and traditions. So, I would concur with Ruben [19]) in the view that the god Brahmā must be considered to be older than the first text which presents him to us. Keith [20]), further, was right in warning against the assumption that the gods of the domestic ritual, who are in large measure those of the śrauta sacrifices, are figures imposed by the priests on popular usage. He properly observed that this assumption would lead to the doctrine that Brahmā had not the slightest popular hold, a suggestion irreconcilable with the prominence given to that deity in the Buddhist scriptures.

The texts of the Buddhists, indeed, often mention Brahmā, and he has apparently been introduced into their tradition at an early time, no doubt because he was a well-known figure in popular religion. Yet, it is necessary to distinguish between the pre-Buddhistic god Brahmā and other Brahmās spoken of by the authors of the Pāli texts. The Buddhist books refer to the view held, at the Buddha's time, of Brahmā as a divine being in a paradise who had created the universe and union with whom was the highest good. To the Buddha himself, who could not recognize any brahmanical conception of the highest good as valid, union with Brahmā must have meant being bound, with him, to this world, and the Buddhist teachers accordingly try to undeceive those who identify Brahmā with the summum bonum; to themselves the god is nothing more (nor less) than the chief of the phenomenal world. Like the universe Brahmā is subject to the saṃsāra. He is the Buddha's pupil, not the Buddha his. I cannot understand why Brahmā's popularity among Buddhists should be entirely imputed to the "malin plaisir de l'embrigader au service du Bouddha" [21]). For, to mention only this, the epics which are strongly affected by other views contain much that recalls the glory and the 'popularity' that was Brahmā's before the rise of other great gods [22]). And all this Brahmā cosmology and Brahmā mythology in which the epic abounds must have been in the making for centuries.

While we need not concern ourselves here with the special Brahmā figures appearing in the Buddhist texts, attention must be drawn to the Brahmaloka, which is only the spatial formulation, popular among

those who like to think in concrete and mythological terms, of the idea denoted by bráhman-Brahmā, especially as far as its eschatological and soteriological aspect is concerned[23]) Now, the name *brahmaloka-* is already (to use an adverb which is to the liking of many authors on these subjects) found in the AV 19, 71, 1 Beside the form *brahmaloka-* we come across in the Brāhmanas the phrase *brahmaṇaḥ salokatam sayujyatam* (KausBr. 21, 1) The representation frequently given in the Buddhist texts, viz that the Brahmaloka, being the highest of the celestial worlds, is the abode of the brahmās, who are reborn there in consequence of virtue, purity and meditation, was already known to thinkers speaking in pre-Buddhist texts, see e g BrhadĀrUp 4, 4, 23 *vipāpo virajo 'vicikitso brāhmano bhavati, esa brahmalokaḥ* "Free from evil, free from impurity, free from doubt, he becomes a brahman This is the brahma-world", and 4, 3, 33, 6, 2, 15; ChāndUp 8, 4, 3, 5, 4; cf. 4, 15, 6, 5, 10, 1 The population of the Brahman-world, the Brahmās, whose name is explained by Buddhavaṁśa Commentary, p 10, as *brūhito tehi tehi gunavisesehi ti* "who has been caused to increase, has been developed or promoted (pāli *brūheti* ∾ skt. *brṃhayati*, here too *brahman-* has been connected with this verb) by a variety of good qualities", are the emancipated, those that have understood that they are brahman (*aham brahmāsmi* BrhadĀrUp. 1, 4, 10[24]), that have gone till the end the way leading to brahman (cf e g ChāndUp. 5 10, 1), those that, also in the non-Buddhist KausUp. 1, 3 ss, after having entered upon the path which "leads to the gods", come in a brahmanworld described as a celestial paradise with beautiful flowers, lakes and nymphs

We may, I think, take for granted that the more 'popular', the more concrete, the 'personal', 'spatial' and mythological representations of the Supreme, called by the name of brahman must have existed side by side with the more 'philosophical' impersonal view for a long period, both being only an attempt to describe the undescribable and both being possibly rooted in a brahman conception wavering between the 'personal' and the 'impersonal' aspect of power[25]) Be this as it may, there is another 'personal' conception of the power going by the name of brahman, which, on the contrary, occurs in the oldest texts, viz. Brhaspati

VIII

It may be useful to add here some remarks on the name *Brhaspati-*.

Whereas Roth in the Pet Dict abstains from giving a literal translation, many other scholars hold it to mean "Lord of prayer or devotion"[1]) and regard the god himself as the divine being especially connected with the mighty power of prayer to secure the ends of man In one of his later publications Keith wavered between this interpretation and "lord of holy power"[2]) This same scholar is quite right to reject Charpentier's view as to this name. "Ein *bṛh-* "Berg, Hohe" konnte auch "Himmelshohe" bedeuten, und somit wäre *Bṛhas-pati-* als "Herr des Himmels" bezeichnet worden"[3]). The identity of the forms *Bṛhaspati-* and *Brahmanaspati-* is, for one thing, beyond dispute, these doublets even alternating in the same sūkta[4]) Further, the character and the functions of this divine figure have so much to do with the *brahmāṇi*, which he utters (1, 40, 5), communicates to the human priest (10, 98, 2, 7), and generates (2, 23, 2), of which he is the supreme king (2, 23, 1, 17 and Geldner's note), that it is practically impossible to suppose that *Bṛhaspati-* = *Brahmanaspati-* had, etymologically, not the same origin as *brahman-* As is well known, this god, moreover, assists the *dhiyah*, without him the sacrifice does not succeed, he is also the 'divine embodiment' of the collective order that called itself bráhma, the individual members of which are brahmáns, in the Brāhmanas his position as the 'Brahman priest' of the gods is repeatedly mentioned[5]) He is, moreover, called the "Lord of brahmans" · Mbh 14, 43, 8[6]) He himself is a *brahmán-* · RV 2, 1, 3 etc.[7]). He is, however, also *bráhman-* and *brahmapati-* "Lord of brahman": ŚatBr 11, 4, 3, 13 See also TaitS 1, 5, 4, 3 *brahma vai devānāṃ bṛhaspatiḥ* Being both *bráhman-* and *brahmán-*, *Bṛhaspati-* is also closely connected with the *brahmavarcas(a)-* the "brilliance or energy of (consisting in) brahman", the "pre-eminence in holiness"[8]) He is *brahmiṣṭha-* "who is b to the highest degree" · TS 2, 6, 8, 7; 9, 3; Bhāg Pur 4, 1, 35 ("ein Brahman in hochster Potenz" Pet Dict). I share, therefore, the view of those who regard the word *bṛhas-pati-* as a so-called improper compound, containing the genitive of a noun *bṛh-*, from the same root as *brahman-*[9])

As to the period to which the compound goes back scholars differ in opinion. Charpentier and Keith, to mention only these two, agree in regarding it as late[10]) Macdonell, who refers to Roth, is wrong in maintaining the same opinion by the argument that the appellations formed with *pati-* to designate "deities, presiding over a particular domain", must in general be comparatively recent as products of reflexion[11]) As a type these names, which are of frequent occurrence

in the Veda, are doubtless old, or rather primitive [12]). they are not only found in other ancient IE languages [13]) — cf Lith *Laũkpatis* "Lord of the field", *Dimstipatis* "Lord of the house" etc —, but also in non-IE cultures. with the Eskimos all things, even a 'mana-like' concept like *sila* "universe, weather; intelligence" have a particular possessor [14]) On the Indonesian island of Timor people are of the opinion that they, when making a fence, prick the lord of the ground, and the natives of Flores call the power of the wind which blows from a certain direction the Lord of that direction or quarter of the sky [15]) Otto Schrader, who regards the Lithuanian names ending in *patis* as very old [16]), adduced an argument which, as far as the type in general and the individual cases under discussion are concerned, doubtless points to their going back to an early date in the Lith *pàts* the meaning "lord", which was IE, has only remained in *viẽšpats* (formerly *viešpatis*) "Lord, God" (<"Lord of the clan") In a similar way, *bṛhas-pati-* must be regarded as comparatively old, because it no doubt contains the gen sg of the lost word *bṛh-*.

As there is no sufficient reason to assume that in an anterior dynamistic period the belief in an impersonal *bráhman-* (neuter) has existed to the exclusion of the belief in a personal aspect of the same "Daseinsmacht" or divine power in a following animistic period, the 'pati-gods' under discussion were, to my mind, a way to formulate the 'personal' aspect of divine powers, and Bṛhaspati as a (personal) Lord of an (impersonal) something was likewise co-existent with the bráhman- (n) aspect, from which he can no more be disconnected than brahmán- (m.). The Brāhmanas indeed never tire of repeating that Bṛhaspati is bráhman-: cf., e.g ŚatBr 11, 4, 3, 13 *bṛhaspatir brahma brahmapatiḥ / brahmavarcasam asmin yajñe mayi dadhātu* [17]). ŚatBr. 12, 8, 3, 29 "The thirty-three gods have Bṛhaspati as purohita, but Bṛhaspati is brahman, therefore this means. they have b. as purohita". Idem 5, 3, 5, 7 "Bṛhaspati is *brahman-*, Indra is *indriyaṃ vīryam*, with these two kinds of vigour (*vīryābhyām*) *enam paribṛṃhanti* (see above)" But, as a personal being, he is able to wield the bráhman, which, then, is regarded as a mighty weapon [18]) See also ŚatBr 3, 1, 4, 15; 5, 1, 4, 14; AitBr 1, 13, 4, 19, 1; 21, 1 etc With his being brahman also tally such facts as his primogeniture (he is the first born from the great light in the highest heaven), his paternity of the gods [19]), his being "Son of strength" or "Lord of strength" [20]), his acting as a deliverer from "Yama's otherworld existence" (AV 7, 53, 1), etc. His relations with ṛta having already been dealt with by Strauss [21]), I only

recall the facts that ṛta is often called *bṛhat,* that Bṛhaspati is said to be born from ṛta (RV 2, 23, 15), and to be its upholder (ibidem 17), that the sacred formulas etc., which are brahman, are *ṛtaprajāta-* [22]), that Varuṇa, the god who maintains ṛta, is closely connected with brahman It is only to be expected that in Ṛgvedic surroundings, where brahman pre-eminently manifests itself in the sacred word and rites, Bṛhaspati, though embracing all things, being the most godlike of gods and "extending widely to all other gods (divine potencies)" (2, 24, 3, 11), is mainly concerned with mantras etc

IX.

In the above remarks I have intentionally emphasized the arguments in favour of the etymology *brahman-* ∾ *bṛh- bṛṃhati,* which has lately been defended or considered by Miss Heimann [1]), Herbert [2]), Bernard [3]) and other authors [4]) Let us, finally, have regard to the merits of another semantic and etymological explanation and to some questions in connection with the derivation of the word In a recent paper Henning [5]) discussed the Iranian side of the brahman problem. He rightly connects MPers, Pahl., Parth. *brahm,* Pahl *brahm(ak)* with the Indian word [6]) and arrives at the conclusion that perhaps the best equivalent in English for the Pahlavi word is "fashion", i e "dress" and "costume" In MPers, Parthian and Pahlavi *brahm* in general means "appearance, form or style, especially of persons, be it the outward appearance (whence "form, gracefulness, fashion, costume, dress") or the style of behaviour (whence "demeanour, propriety, ceremony")" It will readily be seen, Henning argues, that the meaning thus established for MIr *brahm* fits also Old Persian *brazman-* in the much discussed [7]) *artāčā brazmaniya* (Xerx Pers. daiv. 41 ss) which he considers identical. According to him this phrase means "[I worshipped Ahuramazdā] behaving (or: acting) in the proper ceremonial style in accord with Ṛta (the eternal Law ..)", or simply "[I worshipped A] in proper style, in correct fashion" "*Brzmny* must have a fairly wide and general meaning here, it has quite rightly been compared with the Indian *bráhman-*. " Their meanings, too, Henning continues, agree closely In India the word was narrowed to "the ceremonial behaviour and acts of priests at sacrifices" or briefly "rite"; it was further restricted to "the recitations that accompanied and formed part of ritual acts", whence "sacred texts". But this reasoning

does not convince me, because a meaning "ceremonial behaviour .. " is not found in the ancient Indian texts And why have we to assume that the Iranian meaning is the more original one? It seems to me that such ideas as "inherent firmness, supporting or fundamental principle (which are at the root of brahman's meaning, if the above considerations happen to be essentially in accordance with the facts) may provide us with a satisfactory semantic starting-point (One might compare the semantic development of such derivatives of √*dhṛ-* "to hold, bear, maintain" as *dharma-* "that which is firm or established, 'law'" etc [8]), but also (in modern Western translations) "usage, customary observance, prescribed course of conduct etc", and also such meanings as "nature, character, property, peculiarity" and "conformity with correct standards of conduct or behaviour, propriety etc" (compare also the use of the word in modern Indo-Aryan languages) The co-existence of these meanings is in keeping with the traditional Indian philosophy of life [9])

Henning rightly argues that the study of the meaning of the word *bráhman-* has been greatly confused by dragging in Av. *barəsman-* "barsom-twigs" and the words allied to it The semantic development "bunch of grass" > brahman is indeed highly improbable, but Henning's objection to a possible evolution *brahman-* < **barhman-* [10]) is not so ill-founded that it must be discarded · cf ṚV *drahyát* "firmly, strongly", *drahya-* n pr *dṛṃhati* "to make firm, strengthen", *dṛḍha-* "fixed, firm, solid, massive" [11]) Must it, further, be taken for granted that Av *barəsman-* etc, Skt *barhís* "sacrificial grass, a bed or layer of kuśa grass strewed over the sacrificial ground, especially over the vedi etc" and *upabárhaṇa-* "cushion, pillow" are derived from the same root? As to *upabarhaṇa-* it seems not absolutely impossible to connect it with the root *bṛh-* to which, as we have seen, a meaning "to support" can doubtless be ascribed [12]) The AV *barəziš* "stuffed seat, cushion", on the other hand, cannot reasonably be separated from *barhis-*, whether this belongs to √*bṛh-* or *vṛh-* "to pluck, root up, tear" (cf e g ŚatBr 1, 3, 3 10, KātyŚS 22, 10, 24)

I agree with Bartholomae cum suis [13]) and Renou [14]) in considering the etymological identity of the AV. *bərəg-* and *bṛh-* in *bṛhaspati-* probable The usual translation of the word is "rite, religious custom"; we may perhaps prefer "principle(s)" and Y 35, 1 *ahurəm* ... *yazamaide* .. *bərəjā vaŋhəuš ašahe bərəjā daēnayå vaŋhuyå māzdayasnōiš* even a more 'original' meaning might be possible It is important to remember, in this connection, that, the fundamental concept which is

represented by such terms as *brh-* and *brahman-* (or II *brz¹h-, bráz¹h-man-*) being the existence of wonderful power, the manipulation of this power, and the beliefs that develop from it, are religion "The most successful attempt at describing the religious literature and action as a whole is the word *brahman-*" (Bloomfield [15])).

The original identity of Av. *bərəzat-* and *brhat-* is beyond doubt Like the Indian word, and expressing the same shades of meaning, *bərəzat-* is applied to gods, mountains and to the voice When used of living beings (gods, men, animals) it is often coupled with the adjective *amavat-* "strong, vigorous, powerful" Is it necessary to translate Yt. 8, 13 *nars . panča.dasanhō bərəzato ərəamahe amavatō* by " . eines fünfzehnjährigen Mannes, eines hohen, sehr kräftigen, eines starken . " [16])? I would prefer "firm, robust" to Bartholomae's "hochgewachsen, von hoher Statur", on the understanding that the idea of "firmness" had assumed such connotations as "loftiness, elevation, sublimity" The modern Persian *baland, buland* still expresses the meanings "sublime, elevated, exalted, dignified, powerful, high; loud" As, of course, firm ground and solid hills and mountains were at the same time comparatively speaking high parts of the terrain [17]), the term could also connote the idea of "height", which is quite evident in such texts as Vr 19, 2 *hvarə barəzištəm barəzimanąm* But even when it is said that "Ardvī [18]) comes flowing along *barəšna* of a thousand men from the mountain Hukarya", the word *b* does not necessarily express the idea of "height" alone; one may also think of a "compact mass" (cf Yt 5, 1 *pərəθū frākąm*, 3 *masitąm*; *amavaitī*) · Yt 5, 96 *hukairīm barəzō . yahmat . . hača frazgaδaite arədvī . hazaŋrąi barəšna vīranąm* (cf Bund 12, 6 *hukar i buland ān kē āp i ardvīsūr hač aš frōt āvēt 1000 mart bālāk*) Although the meanings "high" and "height" must also be assumed in other passages showing one of the numerous Avestan derivatives of this root, these translations seem to have been adopted too consistently by Bartholomae c s., at times "elevated, sublime; robust, great" or even "solid" would be more to the point [19]) We are, moreover, under the impression that the frequent use of the words *barəz-* (*bərəz-*), *barəzah-*, *barəzišta-* *barəšnu* etc in connection with mountains etc. may easily have affected the meaning of the whole group. As to the verb, which unfortunately occurs only once, an interpretation "make firm, strengthen, to cause to grow up" (and not · "in die Hohe gehen" Bartholomae) is in my opinion at the root of *us . . . barəzayeni* in Yt. 10, 108 *kahmāi . . frazaintīm us apara*

h. ("Wem soll ich edle Nachkommenschaft .. aufwachsen lassen?" Lommel)

It goes without saying that the above remarks do not impair the plausibility of the etymology OHGerm *berg* (Got **baírgs*), MIr *brí* etc ∾ the Avestan group, IE *bhṛg'h-* etc One only might suggest that the idea at the root of such proper nouns as Ir *Brigit*, Germ.-Lat *Burgundiones* etc was "firm, sublime, important" rather than "high" in the literal sense of "extending upwards, having great altitude, tall"; likewise, Ir *Σαυβαρζάνης* was "enhancing prosperity" rather than "Glück erhöhend". If the etymology of the Latin *fortis*, defended by Brugmann, Persson and Hofmann[20]) (*√bherg'h* "erheben", rather some idea like "to be or make firm, to support, to be strong or strengthen by an inherent power etc.") is correct, this word and the ancient form *forctus*, which, then, would be identical with Skt *bṛḍha-, vṛḍha-*, are connected with the above terms The semantic development of *fortis* is worth mentioning, used of physical strength and robustness, it could also express such ideas as "firmus, validus ("frugi et bonus sive validus" Paul Fest), sanus" (applied to women) "robusta, formosa", (applied to wood, trees, the wind, etc) "durable, strong, high (wind)" and also (of moral strength) "brave, valiant" In later Latin we also find such meanings as "long" and "big"[21]) It is to be noted in general that words for "strong, firm, robust etc." usually have a much wider range, being not only used of physical strength etc., but also of moral strength, of mind, feelings etc., and of inanimate objects There is, moreover, no hard and fast line between "strong" and "powerful, mighty etc" which are applied to strength with more emphasis on the active quality

Returning now to the Indian *bráhman-* we draw attention to the fact that it belongs in origin to the well-known class of IE. nouns in *-men-*, the function of which Brugmann[22]) defined thus "War seit uridg Zeit im Gebrauch zur Bildung von nomina actionis, die oft in Dingbedeutung hinüberschwankten (wie gr. *ῥεῦμα* "Strömung, das Strömende"), seltner von nomina agentis", whilst adding · "Das Geschlecht wechselte zwischen neutr und masc., zuweilen bei demselben Worte wie gr *χεῖμα* : *χειμών*". The 'double meaning', 'nomen actionis' and 'nomen rei', shows itself, e g , in a Vedic word like *yāman-* "going, coming; march, (approaching the gods), invocation", cf. also *prabharman-* "reciting" or "recitation" The use of words belonging to this category as so-called infinitives (then, as a rule, accented on the radical

syllable). *bharmane* "to support" (RV. 10, 88, 1; the meaning "load" is mentioned by lexicographers) etc [23]) must be referred to in the same connection. It is well known that also the Greek infinitives in -*μεν* and -*μέναι* express a rather close association between these nouns and the verbal idea Yet it is important to remember that in ancient times there was no sharp line between 'action' and 'object', because objects, qualities, processes were, to a high degree, considered as more or less potent 'substance' [24]) The semantic peculiarity mentioned is, in all probability, connected with the remarkable fact that a word in IE. -*men*- not infrequently denotes some power or other. In Latin there are many instances *nūmen* ("a . power, able to work in one place or another, viz the orendistic power present wherever divine and sacred things are spoken of", being known "only by its effects and manifestations, i e by "movements" (∾ IE √*neu*- "to move") in the most general sense", the word meaning "the particular power and force which is manifested in any movement whatsoever" [25])); *termen* "boundary stone" (a boundary stone "divides and maintains the division, such is its power" [26])); *sēmen* "seed" [27]), *crīmen* "crime", *ōmen*, *carmen* "formula, magic charm etc." [28]) Compare, in Skt. *ojman*- [29]); *dharman*- "established order of things etc " [30]), *dhāman*- "established order (esp of Mitra-Varuna)", *karman*- (in the ṚV used of the soma-sacrifice, Indra's deeds etc); *sāman*- "ritual song of praise" etc Several words in -*men*- refer to sacral or ritual ideas [31]), others denote such parts of the body as were doubtless considered as bearers of power [32]). *roman*- "hair", cf. *marman*- (∾ √*mer*- "to die") "mortal spot". The suffix -*men*- is evidently especially fit to express the idea of powers manifesting themselves either in actions and processes or in beings or objects, or at the same time in actions and beings or objects [33])

Now, side by side with a neuter word in -*man*-, accented on the root-syllable, there exist some corresponding 'agent-nouns' accented on the suffix· *dhárman*- "established order" *dharmán*- "rule" [34]). These words may originally have been adjectives (cf *yáśas*- n "honour"· *yaśás*- adj "honoured") [35]) denoting the idea expressed by the stem as a 'quality' of a potent being or object (cf. also *dhvasmán*- "darkening", *bhujmán*- "abounding in valleys"). This is the linguistic background against which we must regard the masculine *brahmā* and *Brahmā* in their relation to *brahma*

Notes to Chapter I.

[1]) I refer to L. Renou, Les maîtres de la philologie védique, Paris 1928, p 5 ss

[2]) Pet Wtb V, 135, s v *bráhman*

[3]) A B Keith, in J R A S 1933, p. 950

[4]) After this treatise had been written H G Narahari's book Atman in pre-upanisadic Vedic literature, Adyar 1944, reached me, p 22-43 the author gives a survey of the etymological explanations of the word *brahman*. See also Renou, in L. Renou et J. Filliozat, L'Inde classique, I, Paris 1947, § 677

[5]) H Oldenberg, Zur Religion und Mythologie des Veda, Nachr Gott Ges d Wiss 1915, p 196 ss, esp p 201, the same, Zur Geschichte des Wortes *brahman-*, ibidem, 1916, p 717. See also his book Religion des Veda, Register, s v

[6]) Griswold Brahman, A Study in the History of Indian Philosophy, N York 1900

[7]) Oldenberg, Religion des Veda, p 65, n 1

[8]) See also A B Keith, New theories as to brahman, Jhā Commemoration Volume, Poona 1937, p 214 s A similar opinion is upheld by S. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy I (1927, 1948), p 124 From being the subjective force which helped the seer to compose a prayer it came to mean the power of sacrifice, and since in the Brāhmanas the whole universe is regarded as produced from sacrifice, the term came to signify the creative principle of the world Compare also H Jacobi, Die Entwicklung der Gottesidee bei den Indern, Bonn-Leipzig 1923, p 3 ss

[9]) P Masson-Oursel, Esquisse d'une histoire de la philosophie indienne, Paris 1923, p 53

[10]) G van der Leeuw, Religion in essence and manifestation, London 1938, p 36

[11]) H v Glasenapp, Die Philosophie der Inder, Stuttgart 1949

[12]) H Osthoff, in Bezzenbergers Beitrage 24, p 142 ss

[13]) See e g A Walde, Lateinisches etymologisches Worterbuch[2], Heidelberg 1910, p 298, S. Feist, Vergl Worterbuch der gotischen Sprache, Leiden 1939, p 101

[14]) For the sake of brevity I refer to A Walde-J B Hofmann, Lateinisches etymologisches Worterbuch[3], I, Heidelberg 1938, p 512 s

[15]) J Hertel, Das brahman, Indog Forsch 41, p 185 ss (according to him, Ved *brahman-* means "body-heat" and (in the macrocosm, "cosmic heat" or, rather, "Himmelsfeuer", hence in the RV, also "Erzeugnis des im Herzen strahlenden Feuers, Lied"), the same, Die arische Feuerlehre, I, Leipzig 1925 and other books published in the series Indo-Iranische Quellen und Forschungen (Leipsic) and in the Proceedings of the Saxon Academy, Leipsic

[16]) A comprehensive inquiry into the 'fiery aspect' of bráhman and Brahmā remains, however, a desideratum

[17]) J. Charpentier, Brahman, Eine sprachwissenschaftlich-exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung, Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1932, 8

[18]) Th Benfey, Sāmavedārcikam, Die Hymnen des Sāma-Veda, Leipzig 1848, Glossar, p 135

[19]) M Haug, in Sitzungsber Bayer Akad d Wiss 1868, II, p 80 ss See also Charpentier, o c, p. 58, n 1

[20]) "Gewachs, Spross", was sich dann weiter zu "Gedeihen, Wachstum" entwickelt haben soll" (Haug, cf Charpentier, o c, p 58) See also Haug, Brahma und die Brahmanen, Vortrag Akad d Wiss Munchen 1871, p 5 ss

[21]) A Hillebrandt, in Festgabe Jacobi, 1926, p 265 ss.

[22]) L. Meyer, Vergl. Gramm d griech u lat Sprache, II, 1865, p. 275. Compare

also P Kretschmer, Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache, Gott. 1896, p 127 s , A Meillet, Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine[4], Paris 1933, p 78; H Pedersen, in Kuhns Zeitschrift 36, p 82 ss., J Vendryes, in Mémoires de la Société de Ling de Paris 20, p 268, M Leumann, in Stolz-Schmalz, Lateinische Grammatik[5], Munchen 1928, p 154, other scholars are mentioned by Charpentier, o c , p 8, n 2

[23]) For the sake of brevity I refer to the discussion on the crucial point, in which, among other scholars, Leumann joined l c , A Walde-J Pokorny, Vergl Wtb d indogerm Spr II, Berlin-Leipzig 1927, p 209. A Ernout et A Meillet, Dict étym de la langue latine, Paris 1932, p 351, (Meillet, l c), J Pokorny, Indogerm etymol Wtb, Bern 1949, p 154, G Dumézil, Flamen-Brahman, Paris 1935, the same, Servius et la Fortune, Paris 1943, p 22 s , the same, L'héritage indo-européen à Rome, Paris 1949, ch. I, see also Charpentier, o c , p 9, n 3, and S. Feist, Vergl Wtb der gotischen Sprache, Leiden 1939, p 101

[24]) See, e g , O Schrader-A Nehring, Reallexikon der indogerm Altertumskunde, II[2], 1929, p 200. Charpentier, o c , p 9, whose objection that *flāmen* means "priest", whereas the Brahmin has never been a priest in the sense the Romans attached to that word, may be refuted by remarking that an original meaning of *flāmen* comparable to "der mit bráhman versehene, der Inhaber des bráhman" (Ch.) is not beyond the range of possibility Other authors repeatedly lose sight of the fact that beside the neuter word *bráhman-* there existed a masculine term *brahmán-* ("*brāhmana-*), brahman, a person who is versed in the Vedic texts etc"

[25]) Vendryes, Les correspondances de vocabulaire entre l'Indo-iranien et L'Italo-celtique, M S L 20 (1918), p 265 ss

[26]) See n 23

[27]) While comparing, e g , the taboos of 'the brahman' and 'the flamen' Dumézil remarks (Flamen-brahman, p 58, cf also his book Mitra-Varuna, Paris 1948, p 27) "De même que le "brahmane instruit" ne peut être appelé comme témoin, de même le flamen est le seul Romain que l'on ne puisse faire jurer" Now, to swear an oath and to appear as a witness are not entirely identical acts The text quoted by Dumézil, viz Visnusmrti 8, 2, does not include all brahmans among the persons who are disqualified to be witnesses, but only 'learned brahmans', i e *śrotriyāh* ("Brahmans versed in the Veda"). And in a similar way Manu 8,65 says that "the king cannot be made a witness, nor an artisan or an actor nor a *śrotriya-* (i e a brahman versed in the Veda, *adhītaveda-*, "a brahman who unites with a thoroughly verbal knowledge of the sacred texts of his śākhā a full acquaintance with the meaning of the Śrautasūtras and with the actual kriyā or manual work, described in the prayogas", G Buhler, The Laws of Manu, S B E vol XXV, Oxford 1886, p XLVIII), nor a *lingastha-* ("a student of the Veda, brahmacārin" (Kullūka), but according to several other commentators the word also includes ascetics), nor (an ascetic) who has given up all connection (with the world)", and the commentaries remark that the śrotriya cannot be made a witness, because he has to attend to his studies and to the agnihotra, a similar remark applies to the student and the ascetic "who are eagerly occupied with their own duties and absorbed in contemplating brahma" (*svakarmavyagratvād brahmanisthatvāc ca*, Kullūka) But, Kullūka expressly states, because the word śrotriya is used by the author of the text, there is no prohibition to appear as a witness for another brahman when he is intent on studying or offering The Baudhāyanadharmaśāstra (1, 19, 13) likewise exempts śrotriyas and religious mendicants (next royal personages and persons destitute of manliness *śrotriyarājanyapravrajitamānusyahīnāh*) from giving witness Nārada 1,179 makes exception for a learned brahman, and 186 for a brahman who

sells human beings and, therefore, not for brahmans in general Yājñavalkya, 2,70 s. mentions neither brahmans in general nor śrotriyas On Gautama 13,4 ("But a brahman must not be forced to give evidence at the word of a non-brahman, except if ") Haradatta noted "A brahman means here a śrotriya" That Gautama, who tries to favour the brahmans, exempts them from being submitted to ordeals, is another thing; see also J J Meyer, Ueber das Wesen der altindischen Rechtsschriften, 1927, p 304 The Bṛhaspatismṛti, which gives explanatory and supplementary prescriptions on Manu's doctrine, finally, even expressly states (7, 16) that two witnesses may suffice if they are learned brahmans And Manu himself 8, 113 prescribes that a judge must have a brahman swear by his veracity. So, we may conclude that Dumézil's statement does not exactly reflect the Indian facts "Es kann also keine Rede davon sein dass der Brahmane des Eides enthoben sei", has also been Meyer's conclusion (o c, p 305)

[28]) When stating (Mitra-Varuna, p 28) that the "flamen dialis ne peut quitter complètement, même la nuit, les insignes de son sacerdoce , le brahmane ne doit jamais se mettre complètement nu" and regarding these facts as being in agreement, Mr Dumézil forgets to remark that this obligation imposed on the flamen means that he always had to undergo the strengthening influence of these insignia (of his *bhūṣaṇāni*, if one would prefer an Indian term, see my treatise "The meaning of Vedic bhūṣati", Wageningen 1939), just like, up to the present, the Mangkunegara (Surakarta, Java), who, when on a journey, has a bag containing his regalia carried in close proximity The flamen dialis is *quotidie feriatus*, "seine Zeit ist also vollständig der Gottheit und ihrem Dienste gewidmet" (G Wissowa, Religion und Kultus der Römer, München 1912, p 433, no 0, and p 506 s), he is always in function, and, therefore, like other sacred persons in other parts of the world, subject to the said taboo during the whole period of his professional career The prohibition of being naked, on the other hand, is not imposed by Manu (4, 45 the only text Dumézil quotes in this connection) on the brahman in general, but only on the *snātaka-*, the young brahman who has completed his studentship and who is subject to peculiar taboos which are circumstantially described in the dharma-books (see e g A B Keith, The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads, Harvard Univ Press 1925, p 372 s and the parallels to Manu 4, 45, collected by Bühler, SBE, vol 25, p 547 s) And the words of the dharma-texts (Manu literally says: "Let him not eat clothed in only one garment, let him not bathe naked") must in the first place, like their verdict on sleeping naked, which a snātaka is also forbidden (Manu 4, 75), be regarded as a consequence of the widespread fear of the magical harm to which the person who bathes or sleeps without any clothing whatever exposes himself I refer to J J Meyer, Wesen der altind Rechtsschriften; the same, Sexual life in ancient India, London 1930, I, p 262, n 1 (with numerous references)

[29]) See e g F R Lehmann, Die polynesischen Tabusitten, Leipzig 1930, H. Webster Taboo, Stanford, Cal 1942, ch VII, the same, Magic, ibid 1948, ch IX

[30]) A complete list of the numerous taboos imposed on the flamen dialis and his wife may be found in J. Marquardt-G Wissowa, Römische Staatsverwaltung² III, p. 328 ss

[31]) I also refer to my review of Dumézil's book Mitra-Varuna, published in Bibliotheca Orientalis, VI, Leiden 1949, p. 123 s The doctrines of Dumézil have also been rejected by A B Keith, New theories as to Brahman, Jhā Commemoration Volume, Poona 1937, p 208 ss; cf also R. N Dandekar, Twenty-five years of Vedic studies, in Progress of Indic Studies 1917-1942, Bhandarkar Or. Res Inst Poona 1942, p. 59.

32) Dumézil, Flamen-brahman, p. 74

33) Dumézil, o c, p 72 ss, Mitra-Varuna, p. 30

34) Dumézil, Flamen-brahman, p 75 s.

35) According to Deussen (*not to mention others known only to the few*) brahman originally meant "prayer", which elevates the soul, when man perceives the truth and this very prayer developed into a denomination of the "vorweltliches, weltschaffendes Prinzip" (P Deussen, Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie, I 1[1] Leipzig 1920, p 90, 139, 146, 240 etc). Ruben, who referring to RV 10, 125, and to Deussen, o c, p 147, expresses himself in this way · "In den Brāhmaṇas ist damit (i e brahman) im allgemeinen aber noch im ursprünglichen Sinne des Wortes die Zauberformel, das Werkzeug des Brahmanen und die magische Weltmacht hinter der Zauberformel gemeint" (W Ruben, Die Philosophie der Upanishaden, Bern 1947, p 99 s.) shirks the difficulties too rashly.

36) For the sake of brevity I refer to my book Inleiding tot het Indische denken, Antwerpen-Nijmegen 1948, ch II (with further references)

37) "Ou encore "quelle est la cause du brahman?" ou "[le b] comment est-il causé?" A Silburn, ŚvetUp, Paris 1948, p 53.

38) As to the development of the brahman concept see also Hillebrandt, in Hastings' Enc of Rel and Eth II, p 798 s

39) Ruben, o c (see n 35)

40) I refer to the explanations given by S Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, I, London 1927 (reprinted 1948), p 163 ss See also Ruben, o c, p 254 s.

41) Cf also M Falk, Nāma-rūpa and Dharma-rūpa, Calcutta 1943, p 21 ss

42) See E W. Hopkins, The great Epic of India, New-York-London 1902, p 182 s

43) Cf also R Garbe, Die Sāmkhya-Philosophie[2], Leipzig 1917, p 102.

44) I refer to Garbe, o c, p 207, n 2, H von Glasenapp, Entwicklungsstufen des indischen Denkens, Halle (S) 1940, p 107 See also Indian commentaries on BhagGītā 3, 15 etc

45) See also S Dasgupta, A history of Indian philosophy, IV, London 1949, p 40

46) See also Charpentier, o c, p 103 s

47) I refer to Charpentier, o c, p 108 s

48) See e g P Oltramare, L'histoire des idées théosophiques dans l'Inde, I, Paris 1906, p 13 ss It would be advisable *to* use the word *charm to* indicate a material object supposed to possess occult power inherent in it or imputed to it, applying the term *spell* to the magical word.

49) I agree with Keith (Jhā Commemoration Volume, Poona 1937, p. 205) in considering Charpentier (o c, p 76, n 5) to be mistaken with regard to the original meaning of the term *brahmacārin-* · *brahmaṇā saha carati*, *b* being the girdle of muñja grass, which is the characteristic sign of the initiated youth. In my opinion the expression may be explained by comparing the meaning of *car-*, *cārin-* in *dharmacārin-* "fulfilling or observing the dharma", *vratacārin-* "engaged in a religious observance or practice, performing a vow", *tapas carati* "to perform i e to fill oneself with tapas", *pāpam carati* "to commit sin", *bhaikṣam car-* and similar phrases in which *car-* means "to apply oneself to, occupy oneself with", Lat *colere* (which is etymologically cognate) The brahmacārin who lives according to strictly prescribed regulations is a pure vessel destined to be filled with the Veda, i e brahman (cf e g Manu 2, 114 s) (the syllable Om which is to be pronounced at the beginning and the end of a lesson in the Veda lest that lesson should slip away from him, is the highest brahman, Manu 2, 74, 83 s etc., by performing *brahmacarya-* he attains to brahman etc)

Hence his obligatory chastity All potency is the outcome of *brahmacarya-*, i.e. of applying oneself to and filling oneself with the supreme power and holiness, all creatures can be preserved by *brahma* *brahmacāriṇi ābhṛtam* i e "by brahma brought in the brahmacārin" (AV 11, 5, 22)

50) See W D Whitney-C R Lanman, Atharva-veda Saṁhitā, Cambridge Mass 1905, p 143

51) The stanza 2, 1, 2 has, in my opinion, not been correctly explained by A Hillebrandt, Vedische Mythologie², I, Breslau 1927, p. 377, n 2 The same idea that there is much (three-fourths) of reality which is not within the sphere of the senses is also expressed in the famous sūkta ṚV 10, 90, st 3, quoted in the ChāndUp 3, 12, 6

52) See also J Eggeling, The Satapatha-brāhmana I (SBE vol 12), Oxford 1882, p 90, n 1

53) I refer to Oldenberg, Die Religion des Veda, 1923, p 398, n 3

54) The text has *kim idam yakṣam* The word *yakṣa-* does not only denote a class of divine beings, but also 'spiritual apparitions' and such-like L Renou, Kena Upanishad, Paris 1943, p 7 translates "Quel est ce phantasme?"

55) I also refer to the texts collected by R E Hume, The thirteen principal Upanishads translated from the Sanskrit, Oxford 1934, p 40 s

56) S Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, I, p 164

57) R H Codrington, The Melanesians, 1891, p 191 ss first described "that invisible power which is believed by the natives to cause all such effects as transcend their conception of the regular course of nature, and to reside in spiritual beings , being imparted by them to their names and to various things that belong to them . Mana is the active force in all the Melanesians do and believe to be done in magic, white or black By means of this men are able to control or direct the forces of nature , to cause sickness or remove it, to know what is far off in time and space, to bring good luck and prosperity or to blast and curse. By whatever name it is called, it is the belief in this supernatural power and in the efficacy of the various means by which spirits and ghosts can be induced to exercise it for the benefit of men, that is the foundation of the rites and practices which can be called religious " Want of space prevents me from quoting the interesting passage in its entirety

58) For subsequent writings on mana and the discovery of the concept, see especially A Goldenweiser, Anthropology, New York 1946, p. 221 ss For the term 'concept' I refer to my remarks in my treatise on *ojas-* and *ugra-*.

59) Goldenweiser, o c , p 225

60) Hubert et Mauss, Théorie générale de la magie (published in L'année sociologique 1902-1903), p 108 ss

61) N Söderblom, Das Werden des Gotterglaubens, Leipzig 1916, p 270 ss

62) O Strauss, Bṛhaspati im Veda, Diss Kiel 1905, p 20

63) Oldenberg, Die Lehre der Upanishaden und die Anfange des Buddhismus (1915), Gottingen² 1923, p 42 s I also refer to his book Vedaforschung, p 86 s, and to Indogerm Forsch Anz, 8, p 40

64) H von Glasenapp, Der Stufenweg zum Gottlichen, Baden-Baden 1948, p 34

65) Charpentier, Brahman, p 5 s

66) Reference may be made to H Wagenvoort, Roman dynamism, Oxford 1947, Introduction, where much literature on the subject has been mentioned

67) See A Capell, The word "mana": a linguistic study, in Oceania, 9 (1938-9), p. 89 ss It is with regret I have to make some objections to this paper: the author seemingly takes for granted H Kern's derivation of *mana* from Jav *mĕnan* (which does not mean "power, might", but "to win (especially

a game), gain (a lawsuit), surpass in extent etc"), which is, at best, only a possibility, there is no reason to suppose that words like *mana* travelled parts of the Indonesian Archipelago and meanwhile went through a process of degradation we rather must suppose that peoples and tribes travelled and settled down in many areas having their own vocabularies, and that their words, being originally almost identical, in each area developed as to form and meaning, Javanese (and not Malay) *manah* "heart, mind etc" has, etymologically speaking, nothing to do with *mĕnan* etc, because it has been borrowed from Sanskrit (as to the vain efforts to connect the Polyn *mana* with this Skt word see H Kohlbrugge, in Mnemosyne, Bibl class Batava, III, 10 (Leiden 1941), p 54 ss), the Malay word *manah* quoted by N Adriani, Bare'e-Nederlandsch Woordenboek, Leiden 1928, s v *mana* "inherited position" means "heirloom", I would avoid using the term "degradation" in a linguistic study, it seems rather hazardous to connect such words "in many of the languages of the islands off the south-east of Papua" as *mana* (or *mala*) "wind" with the term *mana*, of which it, then, represents only a degradation. the belief that the source of supernatural power is some form of heat is also found in Indonesia, etc

[68]) See also Capell, o c. The reader might also be referred to R R Marett, The Threshold of Religion, 1914, E Arbmann, Seele und Mana, in Archiv fur Religionswissenschaft, 29, 1931, and other books and papers quoted in the above-mentioned works

[69]) In a paper entitled Spirit, Mana and the Religious Thrill (Journal of Philosophy, 13 (1915)) Goldenweiser tried to show that, from a psychological and epistemological standpoint, mana must be regarded as a projection or objectivation of what, on the subjective side, is the religious thrill mana is that which causes the religious thrill.

Notes to Chapter II

[1]) Pet Wtb 5, 135 The history of this etymology has been discussed at length by Charpentier, o c, p 3 s.

[2]) A Pott, Etymologische Forschungen², Lemgo 1859-76, I, p 250, III, p 946

[3]) Deussen, Sechzig Upanishaden des Veda, Leipzig 1897, p 720 s

[4]) H von Glasenapp, Madhva's Philosophie des Vishnu-Glaubens, Bonn-Leipzig 1923, p 27 See also S Dasgupta, A History of Indian Philosophy, IV, 1949, p 111 f, 121 ff

[5]) R K Mookerji, Ancient Indian Education, London 1947, p. 5.

[6]) The attempt to connect this root with the Lat *fascio* has long since been abandoned

[7]) M. Monier-Williams, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Oxford 1899, p. 735

[8]) N Stchoupak, L Nitti et L Renou, Dictionnaire sanskrit-français, Paris 1932, p 516

[9]) O Lacombe, L'absolu selon le Védânta, Paris 1937, p 215, 294; 289

[10]) Manmatha Nath Dutt, A prose English translation of the Mahabharata, I, Calcutta 1895, p 210

[11]) E Burnouf, Le Bhâgavata Purâna, traduit etc, Paris 1840-47, II, p 559.

[12]) See, e g, S Dasgupta, A History of Indian Philosophy (1922—), Indices, and other books on Indian philosophy

[13]) Dasgupta, o c, IV (1949), p 13

[14]) (Brahman-) God's sports are his playful spontaneity which, without satisfying any wants, creates, upholds and dissolves everything

[15]) Burnouf's translation ("ces jeux que développe sa mystérieuse Māyā") is, in my opinion, not correct

16) See on the Sāmkhya theories in this Purāna, Dasgupta, o c, IV, p 24-48

16a) See also S Lévi, La doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brāhmanas, Paris 1898, p 90 s

17) L. Renou, Littérature sanskrite, Paris 1946, p 141

18) Sāyana, Introduction to Ṛgveda, first astaka, edited by the Vedic Research Institute, Tilak Mah Univ I, p 29 and 25 Passing mention may be made of MundUp 1, 1, 5, where the six angas — and in the Ānand edition also the *itihāsapurāṇanyāyamīmāṃsādharmaśāstrāṇi* — are put on a level with the four Vedas, forming together the lower knowledge in contradistinction to the higher knowledge, which is defined as that whereby the Imperishable is acquired

19) Sayana, ibidem, p 29 s

20) G van der Leeuw, Religion in essence and manifestation, London 1938, p 447

21) See J Gonda, The meaning of Vedic *bhāsati*, Wageningen 1939; Origin and meaning of Avestan *spanta-*, Oriens vol 2, p. 195 ss

22) See above, p 27 See also my paper "The meaning of the word alamkāra", in "A Volume of Eastern and Indian Studies in honour of F W. Thomas" (New Indian Antiquary 1939), p 97 ss, V Gronbech, Die Germanen, in Chantepie de la Saussaye, Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte[4], II, Tubingen 1925, p 561 and 567

23) Monier-Williams, o c, p 598. see also M R Kale, The Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa, Cantos XI-XV, Bombay 1924, Notes, p 104

24) See later on, p 34

25) Eggeling, o c (SBE vol 26) translates 3, 6, 1, 28 by "he thus surrounds etc", and 9, 1, 18 "he thus guards etc"

26) See above, p 18

27) See p 40

28) Pet Wtb IV, 548

29) With respect to the difficult passage ŚatBr 1, 7, 3, 4, where the compound seems to be used in a special or elliptic manner, the reader might be referred to the observations made by J Eggeling, The Śatapatha-Brāhmana . . translated, I, p 200, n. 2

Notes to Chapter III

1) C Cappeller, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Strassburg 1891, s v

2) A. A Macdonell, A Vedic Reader for students, Oxford 1928, p 241

3) K F Geldner, Der Rigveda in Auswahl, I, Stuttgart 1907, p 122 See also his translations in Der Rigveda ubersetzt und erlautert, I.

4) Cf e g. K Brugmann, Ber d sachs Ges d Wiss Leipzig 1897, 21 ss.; F Solmsen, Kuhns Zeitschr, 37, p 575 ss, A Walde, Lateinisches etym Wtb.[2], 1910, p 310 s, A Walde-J. B Hofmann, idem[3], I, 1938, p 535 s, A Walde-J Pokorny, Vergl Wtb d IdG Spr II, 1927, p 172 s, S Feist, Verg Wtb d Gotischen Spr, 1939, p 75 s.; J. Pokorny, Indogerm etym. Wtb 1949, p 140

5) I refer to my remarks in my book Δείκνυμι Semantische studie over den indogermaanschen wortel *deik-*, Diss Utrecht 1929, p 9

6) See also Grassmann, Rig-Veda ubersetzt, Leipzig 1876, 1, 35, 4 etc

7) RV. 1, 59, 4 Sayana's "*prabhūta-*" is, I think, nearer to the mark than Geldner's 'hehr' The obscure pāda perhaps refers to Agni's births in heaven and earth

8) Grassmann, Wtb, 23.

9) See Grassmann, Wtb, 294.

10) I refer to E Washburn Hopkins, Epic mythology, Strassburg 1915, p. 9

11) SBE 16, p 271

12) (Bachtold-Staubli etc) Handworterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens, Berlin-Leipzig 1927, I, 1054 s has collected some data concerning the mountain which, according to the mythological ideas of various peoples, is standing in the midst of the world, often bearing the sky Allusions to trembling mountains, etc (e g in Holy Writ) and turns of speech in which mountains figure on account of their being huge and enormous, likewise show that their firmness strongly appealed to the speech making community

13) Note MLat *terra firma*, It *terra ferma* etc, which was (is) also used for "mainland"

14) C D Buck, A dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages, Chicago 1949, p 51 rightly remarks that several of the IE words for "rock, stone" are based on the notion of "solid" See also his remarks (p 25) on ChSl *gora* etc, being the general Slavic term for "mountain" ("further connection with Skt *guru-* Gr βαρύς 'heavy" through the notion of "heavy, solid mass" (Thumb, IF 9, 299) is plausible")

15) Geldner, o c p 304 "*brhat* ist beliebtes Beiwort von *vayas*"

16) See H v Glasenapp, Entwicklungsstufen des indischen Denkens, Halle (S) 1940, ch I

17) As to the rta see also Renou, Journal asiatique, 1949, p 10

18) Oldenberg, Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft, p 150, see also S Lévi, La doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brāhmanas, Paris 1898, p 81

19) Grassmann, Rig-Veda ubersetzt, II, p 348

20) For this point now see Renou, Journal asiatique, 1949, p 11, n 1

21) See L Hilgenberg und W Kirfel, Astāngahrdayasamhitā, Leiden 1941, p 191

Notes to Chapter IV

1) Cp R Thurnwald, in Ebert's Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte, VIII, p 5 "Alles was mit dem *kugi* ("power", "mana" W New Guinea) irgendwo zusammenhangt, wird selbst so benannt ", p 6

2) See also Charpentier, o c, p 4 and p 85, n 4

3) "Segenswort" Geldner, "Zauberspruch und Lobgesang", but " "Zauberritus" weit mehr sinnvoll" Charpentier, o c, p 88

4) Charpentier, o c, p 93

5) See Charpentier, o c, p 114

6) H Beckh, Der Hymnus an die Erde , Stuttgart 1934, p 18 Leaving on one side those remarks of his with which I do not agree, I approve of his view (p 38) that we may learn from 12, 1, 1 that b is regarded as "eine das Leben der Erde 'tragende und ordnende' Macht"

7) Charpentier o c, p 122 ss Geldner has resorted to the translation 'Erbauung bereiten"

8) See also Hillebrandt, Brahman, in Festgabe-Jacobi (Beitrage zur Lit wiss u Geistesgesch Indiens, Bonn 1925) See Haug, Sitz. Ber Akad d. Wiss. Munchen 1868, II, p 89, p 96 "Brahman machen" d h die durch richtiges Zusammenwirken der Lieder Gesange und Opfergaben entstehende magische Kraft, die den Lebenskeim in sich tragt, wird erzeugt"

9) The term 'mana' is likewise applied to power set in motion by ritual, almost regardless of the intention behind the ritual

10) Oldenberg is quite right to observe (Nach Gott. 1916, p 718 s) that such words as *vāc-*, *vacas-*, *uktha-*, *stoma-* are, like *brahman-*, connected with

kr-. But we also find *vācam* or *vācas*, *giras* (*pra*-)*īr*-, *dhiyas jinv*-, *uktham* or *giram jan*- etc

[11]) Geldner (Der Rigveda, I, p 102) translates: "Mit Preisliedern eine feierliche Beschwörung machend" (*brahma krnvanto* . . *arkaih*).

[12]) See also Geldner, Vedische Studien II, Stuttgart 1897, p 146.

[13]) Whitney-Lanman "incantation", "Zauber" or "Pflanzenzauber" (Charpentier, o c , p 78)

[14]) Charpentier, o c , p 78

[15]) See Charpentier, o c , p. 120, n 1

[16]) *The reader may be referred to* P Deussen, Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie, I, 1 (4, 1920), p 310 314, V Henry, Les livres X, XI et XII de l'Atharva Veda . . Paris 1894, p 22 s , 68 s , M Lindenau, Die Skambha-Hymnen des Atharvaveda, Zeitschr. f. Indol u Iran 3, p 235 ss See also M Bloomfield, The Atharva-veda and the Gopatha-brāhmana, Strassburg 1899, p 88

[16a]) As to *āyatana*- and *pratisthā* see also St Schayer, Die Struktur der magischen Weltanschauung, Zs f Buddh 6, p 279 s

[17]) See also Ruben, Die Philosophie der Upanishaden, p 92 ("Charakter der Ruhe der Weltmacht b")

[18]) I refer to P M Modi, Aksara A forgotten chapter in the History of Indian Philosophy Thesis Kiel 1931 (Baroda 1932)

[19]) Swami Vireswarananda Brahma-sutras with text . . comments and index, Advaita ashrama Mayavati, Almora (Him), 1948, p 105 s

[20]) See Dasgupta, A History of Indian Philosophy, III, p 454

[21]) See also such texts as VāyuPur 4, 5 ss (see W Kirfel, Das Purāna Pañcalaksana, Bonn 1927, p 45 ss)

[22]) See also Von Glasenapp, Entwicklungsstufen des indischen Denkens, p 18 and p 107

[23]) See also Haug's remarks, Sitz Ber. Bayer Akad. d Wiss 1868, p 96 and 1871, p 6

[24]) See also such texts as MaitrUp 5, 1.

[25]) L Renou, Sur la notion de *brahman*, Journal asiatique, 237, 1949, p 12 and n 1

[26]) M Bloomfield, in Sacred Books of the East 42, Oxford 1897, p 343 s , Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, p 138, Keith, Rel and Phil , p 188

[27]) See also Bloomfield Journal of the American Oriental Society, 16, 1896, p 12 ss

[28]) See my remarks in "Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung und Wesen des indischen Dramas", Acta Orientalia 19, 1943, p 397 s See also Mānavadh ś, 3, 98 and parallel texts

[29]) I refer to Sacred Books of the East, Vol 50 (Index), p 116. Sacrifices without gifts of food to the brahmans are, as is well known, condemned Offerings made into the mouths of brahmans are regarded as the best (VāsDhś 30, 7 s) To become very prosperous one should feed a brahman with food prepared for the sthālīpāka offering and make him wish prosperity with a suitable mantra (ApDhsū 2, 8 (20))

Notes to Chapter V.

[1]) Some remarks on the purely linguistic side of this word will be found in ch IX

[2]) Koth, in Pet Dict. 5, 137

[3]) See e g. V. Henry, La magie dans l'Inde antique, Paris 1904, p 37

4) Cf also W Ruben, Die Philosophie der Upanishaden, p 85

5) Hillebrandt, in Zeitschr f Indol u Iran 5 (1927), p 223 Cf Haug, Brahman und die Brahmanen, Vortrag Akad d Wiss München 1871, p 8: *brahman* is, in general, "ein Mann, der die Kraft des *brahma* (= "Triebkraft der ganzen Natur") besitzt, in dem sie zur vollsten Erscheinung kommt, und der das Wachstum und Gedeihen des Irdischen wie des Geistigen in seiner Gewalt hat".

6) See, e g , W. Caland, Altindische Zauberei, Amsterdam 1908, p 114

7) Caland, o c , p 116 See also p 73

8) Caland, Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba, I, Göttingen Leipzig 1921, p 102

9) Cf also such variants as *brahma* (ŚāṅkhĀr, 8, 3) *brahma* (AitĀr 3, 2, 3) in an identical passage

10) See my treatise on Skt *ojas-* and *mana-* to be published shortly

11) An enumeration of texts bearing upon the 'lofty claims' of the brahmans can be found in E P Rice, The Mahābhārata, Analysis and Index, Oxford 1934, p 110

12) Other texts may be found in Sacred Books of the East, vol 50 (Index), p 116 ss Speaking to a brahman, e g , is auspicious and purifying, one should not say to him anything except what is auspicious etc

13) Cp also AitĀr 5, 3, 3 " 'This' is the name of this great being He who knows thus 'this' as the name of it, becomes brahman" The Buddha is often described as *brahmabhūta-*, Brahmans repeatedly address him as Brahmā

14) I refer to the authorities cited by H Webster, Magic, Stanford Cal 1948, p 186

15) See Webster, o c , p 189

16) See R Benedict, Religion, in F Boas, General Anthropology, 1938, p 630 Compare also M P Nilsson in Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 22 (1924), p 377 ss

17) F Boas, Die Ausdrücke für einige religiöse Begriffe der Kwakiutl Indianer, in Festschrift Meinhof, Hamburg 1927, p 386 ss (p 388)

18) D N Majumdar, A Tribe in transition, London 1937, p 133 s and Webster, o c , p 12

19) See Webster, o c , p 7 See also G J Held, Papoea's van Waropen, Leiden 1947, p 234

20) For the sake of convenience I refer to G. van der Leeuw, Religion in essence and manifestation, London 1938, ch 13, H Wagenvoort, Roman dynamism, Oxford 1947, Index, p 212, s v mana of the chief, J Gonda, Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung und Wesen des indischen Dramas, Acta Orientalia 19, p 417 ss

21) See e g Webster, o c , p 167 ss

22) See Webster, o c , p 160

23) Webster, o c , p 164 See, moreover, E Lehmann, in Chantepie de la Saussaye, Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte⁴, I, Tübingen 1925, p 46 s

24) See also E Lehmann, in Chantepie de la Saussaye, o c , I, p 46 s

25) I also refer to Oldenberg, Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft, p 140, 153

26) Renou, J A 1949, p 18 See also Bloomfield, AV Hymns, SBE 42, p LXIV

27) Or, according to Renou's wording "Le b est le possesseur de ces révélations 'connectives" qui sont la solution du bráhman-énigme" (p 18).

28) Compare the remarks made by Renou on the silent brahman, o c , p 16 ss — As to the three quarters cf e g RV. 10, 90, 3 d , see also above, p 10

29) See also the obscure stanza AV 8, 9, 3 does *enad* refer to 3ab in its entirety?, is *yasmin* "in whom" and *ekam* the One of ṚV 10, 129, 2?

30) Maryla Falk, Nāma-rūpa and dharma-rūpa, Calcutta 1943, p 4

31) See Oldenberg, Religion des Veda, p 434.

32) I refer to Bloomfield, Vedic Concordance, p 656

33) See also Whitney-Lanman's commentary, p 930 s

34) In AV 19, 43 which, being addressed to eight divinities in succession, the person speaking asks to be conducted to heaven: "Where the brahman-knowers go, , there let Agni conduct me . etc", the last stanza runs .. *brahmā mā tatra nayatu brahmā brahma dadhātu me*, which can either mean "let Brahmā conduct me" (the commentary and Whitney-Lanman), or "let the brahmán conduct me, let the brahmán give me bráhman" (cf 19, 9, 12) there are, indeed, texts, which put the brahmán on a par with the gods AV 6, 12, 2 "What was known by brahmans, what by seers, what by gods with that I ward off thy poison", cf also 12, 4, 10 The gift of a cow to a brahman brings progeny (AV 12, 4, 1), a goat given to him sets the donor "on the back of the firmament" (9, 5, 10, cf 7-12)

35) I refer to A A Macdonell and A B Keith, Vedic Index of names and subjects, London 1912, II p 82 ss ; Keith, Rel and Phil., p 414 and 481 Compare also Bloomfield, The Atharva-veda and the Gopatha-brāhmana, § 56 (p 76 ss), who p 76 expresses himself in the following way "Especially pronounced is their claim of 'inviolability' ; oppression and murder of brahmans is the sin against the holy ghost "

36) Cf also such texts as AV 14, 2, 41, RV 10, 85, 34-35 (35 ∾ AV 14, 1, 28)

37) See my remarks "Het begrip bhakti", in Tijdschrift voor Philosophie (Louvain) 10, 1948, p 631 ss

38) See above, p 32, 40

39) "Hier wird Agni als Brahmanaspati angeredet, d h mit ihm identifiziert, sofern er als Priester brahman ist", Geldner, Der Rigveda, I, p 248

40) See especially Hillebrandt, in J Hastings' Encycl of Rel and Eth II, 1909, p 796 ss

41) Cf. AV 11, 5, 22 " . (the) bráhman protects, defends (*raksati*), brought in (*ābhrtam*, see my paper Ābharana, New Indian Antiquary, II (1939), p 69 ss) in the brahmacarin

42) With Caland, in Wiener Zeitschr f d Kunde des Morgenl 14 (1900), p 123 ss

43) Cp the terms *brahmīyas-* and *brahmistha-*, AitĀr 3, 2, 3, ŚānkhĀr 8, 3 As to the meaning of the suffixes, see now also E Benveniste, Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen, Paris 1948, p 123 ff

44) The learned brahman is the true brahman, see the texts adduced SBE 50, p 116 ss The comparatively small importance of his performing other rites appears also from such texts as Manu 2, 87

45) See Bloomfield, in SBE 42, p LXIII s and n 1

46) According to Bhattabhāskaramiśra on TaitBr 3, 10, 11, 4 *sarvavidyā* is *sarvavidyādhyayanapunyaphalāvāptihetuh*

47) It is worth noting that, according to Oldenberg's investigations (Nachr Kon Ges d Wiss Göttingen, ph -h Kl 1916, p 728) bráhman denoted on the one hand "die Textmassen der drei Veden", on the other hand, however, "a great variety of religious texts" and, hence, especially those texts which did not enter into the three categories of *rcah*, *yajūmsi* and *sāmāni*

48) On the *brahman-* or *brāhmanācchamsin-* and his office to strengthen Indra and the predilection for the word *brahman-* in connection with the liturgical vardhanam of this god see A. Bergaigne, La religion védique . II, Paris 1881, p 273 s ; Oldenberg, Nachr, Gött 1916, p. 732 ss

Notes to Chapter VI

[1]) L. Renou, Sur la notion de bráhman, Journal asiatique, 237, 1949, p. 7 ss.
[2]) Renou, o c, p 14
[3]) The older translation "playful discussion of theological questions or problems" (Monier-Williams, s v) is, of course, inadequate
[4]) W Schultz, in Pauly-Wissowa (see further on), 125 is wrong in assuming the contrary
[5]) I refer to N Adriani, Verzamelde Geschriften, Haarlem 1932, II, p 301 s and III, p 49 s , see also I, p 25, II, p. 395
[6]) See Adriani, in Tijdschrift van het Kon Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen 51 p 367 See, however, also the same, Bare'e Nederlandsch Woordenboek, 1928, p 917
[7]) I refer to Paulhan, Les hain-tenys merinas, Paris 1913, p 2 s , 14 s
[8]) G Ferrand, Note sur les Hain-teny Merina, Journal asiatique, 11-4, 1914 II, p 151 s.
[9]) See also Oldenberg, Nachr Gott 1916, p 718
[10]) See A C Kruyt in Mededeelingen vanwege het Nederlandsch Zendelinggenootschap 54, 1910, p 223, 228 See also vol 39, 1895, p 142 s
[11]) See N P Wilken and J A Schwarz in the same periodical 11 1867, p 357
[12]) I refer to J G Frazer, The golden Bough IX, London 1913, p 121, n 3
[13]) See also Buhler's adnotation, SBE, 25, p 118
[14]) Compare also J Przyluski, in Journal asiatique 205, 1924, p 122 ss
[15]) I refer to my treatise The meaning of Vedic *bhūsati*, Wageningen 1939, p 22 Thus, we hear of contests between reapers of corn to secure the vigour of the grain, see e g Frazer, o c, VII, p 74 s
[16]) Frazer, o c III, London 1911, p 154
[17]) See W Schultz in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopadie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, II-I, Stuttgart 1920, 62 ss , J A Kelso, in Hastings' Encycl of Rel and Ethics, 10, 765 ss , A Heusler, Die altnordischen Ratsel, in Zeitschrift des Vereins fur Volkskunde in Berlin, 1901, p 124
[18]) In the Javanese Babad Tanah Jawi the god Batara Visnu and king Watu Gunung agree upon propounding a riddle instead of fighting on the battlefield B T J, ed Olthof, The Hague 1941, text p 10, translation p 10 Compare SatBr 1, 5, 4, 6
[19]) See also H Torczyner, The riddle in the Bible, Hebrew Union College Annual, I, Cincinnati 1924, p 125 ss
[20]) See Renou, o c, p 13
[21]) See also K A H Hidding, Gebruiken en godsdienst der Soendaneezen, Batavia 1935, p 114, Hoesein Djajadiningrat, De magische achtergrond van de Maleische pantoen, Batavia 1933
[22]) The predilection for "etymological research" often found at a semi-primitive stage of civilization is closely related to this inclination
[23]) Discussed by Renou, o c, p 37 ss
[24]) See e g Schultz, Ratsel aus dem hellenischen Kulturkreise II, in Mythologische Bibliothek, V, Leipzig 1912/13, p 39, 88 ss , 92 ss , 117 ss ; H Lessmann, Aufgaben und Ziele der vergleichenden Mythenforschung, ibidem I, Leipzig 1908, p 25 ss , O Schrader-A Nehring, Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde, II, Berlin-Leipzig 1929, p 210 s
[25]) Schrader-Nehring, o c, p 211
[26]) I completely agree with the explanation proposed by Renou, o c, p 13, n 2
[27]) See J Gonda, Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung und Wesen des indischen Dramas, Leiden 1943, p 420 ss

Notes to Chapter VII

1) Thus H. Zimmer, Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilization, Washington DC 1946, p. 123.

2) Thus H. von Glasenapp, Brahma et Bouddha, Paris 1937, p. 109, the same, Die Religionen Indiens, Stuttgart 1943, p. 142, W. Ruben, Die Philosophie der Upanishaden, Bern 1947, p. 228. See also J. Masson, La religion populaire dans le Canon bouddhique pali, Louvain 1942, p. 81 "Leur nom (viz Brahmā), masculinisé, vient du neutre upanişadique".

3) Oldenberg, Die Lehre der Upanishaden und die Anfänge des Buddhismus², Göttingen 1923, p. 92 n. 1.

4) Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy I, p. 102.

5) Both the ideas of *akṣaram* and *puruṣah* are dealt with alternatively and independently of each other.

6) Radhakrishnan, o.c. I, 96 ss.

7) Oldenberg, Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft, Göttingen 1919, p. 97.

8) Von Glasenapp, Entwicklungsstufen des indischen Denkens, Halle (S.), p. 17 s. See also p. 145.

9) I also refer to P. M. Modi, Akṣara, a forgotten chapter in the history of Indian Philosophy, Diss. Kiel, 1931 (Baroda 1932).

10) J. H. Driberg, The Lango, London 1923, pp. 216 ff., 224, 241, n. 1, Webster, Magic p. 16.

11) Webster, l.c.

12) Webster, o.c. p. 14. See also o.c. p. 31.

13) See Webster, o.c. p. 31.

14) As to the "vague character" of mana itself, which wavers between the personal and the impersonal (see Marett, The conception of Mana, Transactions of the 3rd Intern. Congress for the history of religions, Oxford 1908, I, p. 46 s.), is personal as well as impersonal (J. P. B. de Josselin de Jong, De Waarderingsonderscheiding van levend en levenloos in het Indogermaans etc., Thesis Leiden 1913), neither psychical nor physical (see also E. Arbmann, Seele und Mana, Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, 29, 1931, p. 293 ss., who p. 301 s. observes that mana is essentially "eine gewissen Entitäten—Personen, Tieren, Gegenständen, Stoffen, Örtlichkeiten, Zeiten, Zaubersprüchen, Namen usw. — zukommende Eigenschaft, ... die eigentümliche Fähigkeit, die gewissen Personen, Dingen und anderen Entitäten zukommt und sich in der Art ihres Wirkens zu erkennen gibt, indem dieses als einer ihnen innewohnenden Kraft entsprungen ... vorgestellt wird. Mana ist eben Kraft, übernatürliche Kraft, Zauberkraft, als Eigenschaft eines Willens oder als unpersönliche Potenz..."). Compare also A. Goldenweiser, Anthropology, New York 1946, p. 221 ss., R. Benedict, in F. Boas, General Anthropology, Boston 1938 ch. XIV.

15) R. Benedict, o.c., p. 629.

16) See H. Frankfort and others, Before Philosophy (The Intellectual adventure of Ancient Man 1946), Harmondsworth 1949, p. 22.

17) See also A. B. Keith, Aitareya Āraṇyaka, Oxford 1909, p. 304, n. 23.

18) I refer to my paper "The so-called secular, humorous and satirical hymns of the Ṛgveda", in Orientalia Neerlandica, Leiden 1948, p. 312 ss.

19) Ruben, o.c., p. 222 "Im Volke der Adligen und Bauern gab es sicher Kreise, die die mystische Macht der Brahmanen, das brahman, nicht in seiner Abstraktheit verstanden, sondern als Gott deuteten."

20) Keith, Religion and philosophy ..., p. 55.

21) Masson, o.c., p. 83. I now refer to A. K. Coomaraswamy and I. B. Horner, The living thoughts of Gotama the Buddha, London etc. 1948, p. 26 s.

22) See e.g. E. W. Hopkins, Epic Mythology, Strassburg 1915, p. 189 ss.

[23]) For convenience the reader might be referred to J Masson, La religion populaire dans le Canon bouddhique pâli, p 53-83, and to G P Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pali proper names, II, London 1938, p 336 ss See also Von Glasenapp, Entwicklungsstufen , p 43 "Ein Unterschied zwischen beiden (viz *brahman*, n and the *brahmaloka*) scheint für die Auffassung der alten Zeit nicht zu bestehen, weil zwischen etwas Persönlichem und Unpersönlichem ebensowenig ein Trennungsstrich gezogen wird wie zwischen einem Gott und seinem Reich"

[24]) See also AitÄr 5, 3, 3

[25]) Compare the remarks made by Keith, Rel and Phil, p 209

Notes to Chapter I III

[1]) See e g Monier Williams, Dict, 737, A A Macdonell, A Vedic Reader for Students, Oxford, p 84 See also Keith, Rel and Phil p 438 "god of prayer", H D Griswold, The Religion of the Rigveda, Oxford 1923, p 168, Radhakrishnan, *o c*, I, p 89

[2]) Keith, Jhā Comm Vol, p 215, he rejects, however, the view that *brahman-* itself primarily denotes "power"

[3]) Charpentier, o c, p 66, n 0

[4]) I refer to Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, Strassburg 1897, p 101, Bloomfield, The Atharva-veda and the Gopatha-Brāhmana, p 34, 74 and 117

[5]) As to the character, the position and the activities of Brhaspati in the Veda see Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, § 36, O Strauss, Brhaspati im Veda, Diss Kiel, Leipzig 1905, Griswold, The Religion of the RV, p 168 ss, Oldenberg, Brhaspati, in Nachrichten von der Kön Ges d Wiss zu Göttingen, Ph h Kl 1915, p 196 ss, Keith, Rel and Phil, p 162 ss, Oldenberg, Religion des Veda, Register, s v

[6]) I also refer to E W Hopkins, Epic Mythology, Strassburg 1915, p 82 and 181

[7]) See also Griswold, The Rel of the RV, p. 172

[8]) See Strauss, o c, p 46 s

[9]) See, e g A Macdonell, (Kuhn's) Zs für vergl Sprachw, 24, p. 292 ss Strauss, o c, p 14 ss, and especially p 17, J Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik, II, 1, Göttingen 1905, p 240 As to the accent of the word W D Whitney, A Sanskrit Grammar[5], Leipzig 1924, § 390 b

[10]) Charpentier, o c, p 65, n 4 is compelled to the view that both *brhaspati-* and *brahmanaspati-* are "späte Bildungen, die erst in einer Zeit aufgekommen sind, wo *bráhman-* seine ursprüngliche Bedeutung verloren hatte" Compare also Keith, Jhā Comm Vol, p 215 Radhakrishnan, o c, p 89, holds the view that Brahmanaspati "is a very late god, belonging to the period when sacrifices began to come into vogue" But even if the Indians or their 'Aryan or IE ancestors' had known a period without sacrifice, without, at least, a form of less complicated and developed sacrifice — a supposition which I would reject —, the figure of B may have existed, prior to that in a somewhat different role.

[11]) Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, p 103

[12]) Enumerations and discussions e g in Wackernagel, o c, p 246 s, Strauss, o c, p 14 s, Oldenberg, Religion des Veda (1923), p 61 s. — See also Oldenberg, o c, p 34, n 1

[13]) See H Usener, Götternamen, Bonn 1896, p 89

[14]) K Birket-Smith, Geschichte der Kultur, Zürich 1946, p 388

[15]) Information from the Rev P Middelkoop and Father K van Trier

[16]) See O Schrader, Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde, 2 Aufl herausg von A Nehring, II, Berlin-Leipzig 1929 p 248 Schrader, in Hastings' Encycl of Rel and Ethics II, p 35 note, see also A Bruckner, Osteuropäische Götternamen, KZ 50, p 161 ss

17) I refer to Strauss, o c, p 23, 46 s See also such texts as discussed by W Caland, Altindische Zauberei, Amsterdam Academy 1908, no 46, 47; 102, 103, 105 etc, Oldenberg, Vorw Wiss p 139

18) See Strauss, o c, p 25.

19) Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, § 36

20) Hopkins, Epic Mythology, p 65 and 134, Griswold, The Rel of the RV, p 168 s

21) Strauss, o c, p 26 ss

22) "Here brahman is represented as an expression or instrument of eternal order ", Griswold, o c, p 174.

Notes to Chapter IX

1) B Heimann, Studien zur Eigenart indischen Denkens, Tubingen 1930, p 40 ss (*bráhman-* "Anschwellung der Kraft") she, however, sticks to the opinion that O Irish *bricht* is an etymological cognate of *b.*, which, therefore, must have meant "Hymnus, Spruch der Starke verleiht" In details I cannot share her views which are, to my mind, too onesidedly based on a theory of evolution.

2) J Herbert, Spiritualité hindoue, Paris 1947, p 59 "Le nom même de Brahman vient de la racine *brh-*, qui dénote l'extension, il indique "l'essence qui se répand universellement ou la substance qui s'est universellement diffusée"

3) Theos Bernard, Philosophical Foundations of India, London 1948, p 133. "brahman (∾ *brh-*) that which has reached its ultimate evolution, development, extension, or growth"

4) It may be added that other authors expressed themselves in favour of an original meaning "power" without hazarding an etymology Hopkins, Ethics of India, New Haven 1924, p 85 " this neuter Power (for such was always the real meaning of *b* underlying the later meanings of spell and spirit)"; Renou, Anthologie sanskrite, Paris 1947, p 33 "*brahman*, à l'origine sans doute 'force' cosmique, invigoration cosmique puis parole sacrée, logos, fondement éternel de la formule et de la prière"

5) W B Henning, Bráhman, in Transactions of the Philological Society 1944, London 1945, p 108 ss

6) See also H W Bailey, BSOS 7, p 403

7) See W Hinz, Altpersischer Wortschatz, Leipzig 1942, p 73, and Henning, o c p 108, n 1 E Herzfeld (Archaeologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, VIII, Berlin 1937, p 59), who edited the text, read *'rtāčā brazmaniy* and translated (p 62) "da verehrte ich Ahuramazdā) mit 'Rtam dem brazmanischen", see also his remarks p 69 H W Bailey, Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-century Books, Oxford 1943, p 87, no 4 proposes to read *'rtanhāčā brazmaniya*, both nom sing and to translate "following rta and possessing (associated with) the brazman" Although this mystery remains unsolved, the connection of this *brzmniy* with MIr *brahm* and OInd *brahman* may be taken for granted

8) See also such texts as ŚatBr 11, 1, 6, 24 and the remark made by S Lévi (La doctrine du sacrifice, p 159 f) "Base primordiale de la création qu'elles supportent (*dhar-*), les eaux réalisent matériellement la loi (*dharma-*) qui est, en vertu de son nom même, la base universelle"; Masson-Oursel, Esquisse d'une histoire de la philosophie indienne (Paris 1923), p 35 f

9) As to such meanings as "costume, dress", mentioned by Henning, it may be remembered that the Eng *dress* (noun) is etymologically identical with *dress* (verb) "to put into order etc" from MLat **directiare* (cf Lat. *directus* "straight") Eng *costume* "style, fashion, or mode of dress etc", like *custom* "established practice" comes from the Lat *consuetudo* "custom".

10) Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik, I, Göttingen, p. 213

[11]) As to *dṛh-* and *bṛh-* compare also ŚatBr 2, 1, 1, 9 ss *hantemām pratiṣṭhām dṛṃhāmahai* *evam imām pratiṣṭhām* (note the object!) *paryabṛṃhanta*.

[12]) AV 15, 3, 7 the *bráhman-* is called the *upabárhaṇam*! Cf also the Armenian *barj* "cushion", *barjr* (*u-* stem) "high" etc

[13]) C. Bartholomae, Altiranisches Wörterbuch, Strassburg 1904, 957 See also H Osthoff, in Bezzenberger's Beiträge, 24, p 130 s

[14]) Renou, J. A, p 10, n 1

[15]) Bloomfield, The Atharva-veda and the Gopatha-brāhmaṇa, p 30

[16]) H Lommel, Die Yašt's des Awesta, Gottingen-Leipzig 1927, p 52.

[17]) In addition to the remarks made in chapter III we should remind ourselves that such ideas as "thick, bulky" and, hence, "large, big" or "high" are apt to be associated with "firm, strong, able to bear, robust" Russ *bol'šoj* "large, big" ∼ Skt *bala-* "strength"; Arm *stvar-* "thick" ∼ OHG *stāri* "strong" etc. On the other hand, words meaning "to strengthen, increase" are etymologically related to words for "high" Lith *aukštas*, Lett *augsts* "high" ∼ Skt *ojas-*, Lat *augēre* See also C D Buck, A dict of selected Synonyms, 1949, ch 12, 31, 63, 64 and some of the remarks made by P Persson, Beiträge zur indogerm Wortforschung, Uppsala 1910-12, I, p. 53

[18]) See also H S Nyberg, Die Religionen des alten Iran, Leipzig 1938, p 260 ff

[19]) The Sanskrit explanations of *bərəzant-* are *mahān*, *mahattarah*, *udagratarah*

[20]) See A Walde-J B Hofmann, Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Heidelberg 1938, p 535 ss.

[21]) A. Souter, A glossary of later Latin to 600 A D., Oxford 1949

[22]) K Brugmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen, II, Strassburg 1892, p 343

[23]) For more instances see W D Whitney, A Sanskrit grammar, § 974

[24]) See e g H v Glasenapp, Entwicklungsstufen des indischen Denkens, Halle (S), 1940, ch I, 1

[25]) Compare F Pfister in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopadie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, 17 (1937), 1273, 1289 s; and H Wagenvoort, Roman Dynamism, Oxford 1947, p 73 ss

[26]) Wagenvoort, o c, p 82

[27]) Wagenvoort, o c, p 194

[28]) See also J Gonda, in Mnemosyne, III, 6, Leiden 1938, p 162

[29]) See my treatise on the *ojas-* and *ugra-* concept

[30]) See P Masson-Oursel, in Journal asiatique XI, 19, p. 269

[31]) See also W Porzig, IF 42, p 221 ss The etymology, proposed by this author (IE **men-m(e)n-*, OInd *manma* "thought" and by H. Hirt, Indogermanische Grammatik, III, Heidelberg, p 203, does not convince me

[32]) Compare also Porzig, o c p 254 (instead of 'Seelenträger' I would prefer 'Kraftträger')

[33]) " in den Kräfte schlummern, die ohne menschliches Zutun ihre Wirkungen hervorbringen" Porzig, o c, p 226

[34]) For more instances see Whitney, o c, § 1168, c Such couples as *várṣman-*: *varṣmán-* "height, top", which have the difference of accent and gender without a corresponding difference of meaning, may be compared to Gr κεῦθμα κευθμών "remote spot"

[35]) See also E Benveniste, Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen, Paris 1935, I, p. 121 ss, who (p. 124) remarks. " . on est mis en garde contre l'application trop facile de la notion de valeur "animée" à tous les noms qui, historiquement, se présentent comme masculins ou féminins".